

CAUCHY PROBLEM FOR DISSIPATIVE HÖLDER SOLUTIONS TO THE INCOMPRESSIBLE EULER EQUATIONS

SARA DANERI

ABSTRACT. We consider solutions to the Cauchy problem for the incompressible Euler equations on the 3-dimensional torus which are continuous or Hölder continuous for any exponent $\theta < \frac{1}{16}$. Using the techniques introduced in [DLS12] and [DLS12H], we prove the existence of infinitely many (Hölder) continuous initial vector fields starting from which there exist infinitely many (Hölder) continuous solutions with preassigned total kinetic energy.

CONTENTS

1. Introduction	1
1.1. Structure of the paper	4
Acknowledgments	4
1.2. Notation	4
2. Main perturbation step	5
3. Preliminary geometric and analytic facts	6
4. Construction of the maps v_1 , p_1 and \tilde{R}_1	9
4.1. Mollifications	9
4.2. Construction of v_1	10
4.3. Definition of p_1	11
4.4. Definition of \tilde{R}_1	11
5. Proof of the main perturbation step	11
5.1. Doubling the variables and corresponding estimates	11
5.2. Estimates on v_1	14
5.3. Estimates on the energy	14
5.4. Estimates on the Reynolds stress	15
5.5. Proof of Proposition 2.2	16
6. Admissible initial data	20
7. Proof of Theorem 1.1	23
8. Continuous solutions	27
References	32

1. INTRODUCTION

In this paper we deal with continuous and Hölder solutions of the Cauchy problem for the Euler equations on the 3-dimensional torus $\mathbb{T}^3 = \mathbb{S}^1 \times \mathbb{S}^1 \times \mathbb{S}^1$

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t v + \operatorname{div}(v \otimes v) + \nabla p = 0 & \text{in } \mathbb{T}^3 \times (0, 1) \\ \operatorname{div} v = 0 & \text{in } \mathbb{T}^3 \times (0, 1) \\ v(\cdot, 0) = v_0 & \text{in } \mathbb{T}^3. \end{cases} \quad (1.1)$$

A pair $(v, p) \in C^0(\mathbb{T}^3 \times [0, 1]; \mathbb{R}^3 \times \mathbb{R})$ is a *continuous solution* of (1.1) with initial datum $v_0 \in C(\mathbb{T}^3; \mathbb{R}^3)$ if it satisfies (1.1) in the weak distributional sense. Equivalently, on all simply connected subdomains $U \subset \mathbb{T}^3$ with C^1 boundary and for all $t \in (0, 1)$

$$\begin{aligned} \int_U v_0(x) dx &= \int_U v(x, t) dx + \int_0^t \int_{\partial U} [v(v \cdot \nu) + p\nu](x, s) dS(x) ds, \\ \int_{\partial U} [v \cdot \nu](x, t) dS(x) &= 0, \end{aligned}$$

being ν the outer unit normal to ∂U and dS the surface measure on ∂U .

Moreover, a continuous solution to (1.1) is an *Hölder solution* with exponent $\theta \in (0, 1)$ if $\exists C > 0$ s.t.

$$|v(x, t) - v(x', t)| \leq C|x - x'|^\theta, \quad \forall x, x' \in \mathbb{T}^3, \forall t \in [0, 1]. \quad (1.2)$$

Given a nonnegative continuous function $e : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, we say that $v : \mathbb{T}^3 \times [0, 1] \times \mathbb{R}^3$ has *total kinetic energy* e if

$$\int_{\mathbb{T}^3} |v(x, t)|^2 dx = e(t), \quad \forall t \in [0, 1].$$

It is known since the '20s (see [Gun26] [Lic25]) that, if v_0 is sufficiently smooth, then there exists a unique classical solution of (1.1) on a time interval $[0, T]$, $T = T(\sup\{|v_0(x)| : x \in \mathbb{T}^3\}) > 0$ (for a modern result assuming $v_0 \in H^s(\mathbb{T}^3)$ with $s > 2$, see e.g. [BM02]). Moreover, its total kinetic energy is constant.

However, in 1949 Onsager first conjectured the existence of weak solutions which are dissipative, namely whose total kinetic energy is monotone decreasing. This phenomenon, that in fluid dynamics literature is called “anomalous dissipation”, is consistent with the energy inequalities satisfied by weak limits of Leray solutions of the Navier-Stokes equations. In [Ons49] Onsager stated more precisely that $C^{0,\theta}$ -solutions are conservative when $\theta > \frac{1}{3}$, while there exist dissipative $C^{0,\theta}$ solutions for any $\theta < \frac{1}{3}$. By $C^{0,\theta}$ solutions we mean vector fields $v \in C^0(\mathbb{T}^3 \times [0, 1]; \mathbb{R}^3)$ satisfying (1.2).

The first part of the conjecture was completely settled by Eynik [Eyi94] and by Constantine, E and Titi [CET94].

The second part is, in its full generality, still open. The first example of weak solution violating the energy conservation was given by Scheffer [Sch93], who showed the existence of a nontrivial compactly supported weak solution in $\mathbb{R}^2 \times \mathbb{R}$. A different example of nontrivial compactly supported weak solution in $\mathbb{T}^2 \times \mathbb{R}$ was then given by Shnirelman in [Shn97]. In both cases the solutions are only square summable and it is not clear whether there are time intervals in which their total kinetic energy is monotone decreasing. The first proof of existence of solutions with monotone decreasing total kinetic energy was given by Shnirelman in [Shn00]. This solution belongs to the energy space $L^\infty([0, +\infty); L^2(\mathbb{R}^3))$.

In [DLS07], De Lellis and Székelyhidi proved the existence of nontrivial compactly supported bounded weak solutions in any space dimension. Moreover, such solutions can attain a prescribed total kinetic energy for almost every time $t \in [0, +\infty)$. The full control of the total kinetic energy for all times was finally achieved in [DLS10], in which they could prove the existence of compactly supported solutions $(v, p) \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d \times [0, +\infty); \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R})$ with $v \in C([0, +\infty); L^2(\mathbb{R}^d; \mathbb{R}^d))$ and

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |v|^2(t) = e(t), \quad \forall t \in [0, +\infty),$$

being $e : [0, T] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ any positive continuous function given a priori. In particular, setting $v_0 = \lim_{t \rightarrow 0} v(t)$ in the L^2 norm, (v, p) is a bounded weak solution of the Cauchy problem (1.1) with prescribed total kinetic energy e . As a corollary, choosing e to be a monotone decreasing function, they obtain the existence of bounded dissipative solutions in all dimensions, thus extending Shnirelman’s result [Shn00]. Given a suitable initial datum v_0 for which such solution exists, De Lellis and Székelyhidi’s method provides for an infinite set of solutions with the same total kinetic energy. Hence, on the one hand, it turns out that none of the admissibility criteria based on energy inequalities which have been proposed for the Euler equations is able to single out a unique solution for arbitrary L^∞ initial data (see also [BT10] for explicit examples of L^2 weak solutions of (1.1) having constant total kinetic energy). On the other hand, by the local existence and uniqueness of classical solutions and the weak-strong uniqueness of the so-called *admissible measure-valued solutions* of (1.1) proved in [BDLS11] –including all dissipative L^2 weak solutions– the vector fields v_0 for which one has such severe loss of uniqueness can not be too regular. These initial data –which in [DLS10] are called *wild initial data*– are nonetheless proved to be a dense set in the space of L^2 divergence free vector fields [SzW12] and they include also the classical vortex sheet (see [Sz11]).

In [DLS12] and [DLS12H] De Lellis and Székelyhidi developed their method up to prove the existence of respectively continuous and $C^{0,\theta}$, with $\theta < \frac{1}{10}$, solutions having prescribed total kinetic energy on the 3-dimensional torus. In [ChDLS12] the results of [DLS12] are extended to the 2-dimensional case. Recently, Isett [Ise12] did one step forward towards the proof of Onsager's conjecture, constructing global weak solutions to the 3-dimensional incompressible Euler equations which are zero outside of a finite time interval and have velocity in the Hölder class $C^{0,\theta}$ for every $\theta < \frac{1}{5}$. In [BuDLS13] the authors have considerably simplified the proof of [BuDLS13], though taking advantage of its main new ideas, and showed the existence of $C^{0,\theta}$ solutions whose total kinetic energy is dissipated for any $\theta < \frac{1}{5}$.

The aim of this paper is to extend the results of [DLS10] showing that the set of initial data for which one can get infinitely many Hölder solutions which dissipate the total kinetic energy, is an infinite subset of $C^{0,\theta}(\mathbb{T}^3; \mathbb{R}^3)$, for θ smaller than a suitable constant. Using the estimates provided in [DLS12H], we get such result for any exponent $\theta < \frac{1}{16}$, but we believe that the ideas of our method, when implemented with finer estimates (see e.g. [Ise12] and [BuDLS13]), can raise the threshold of non-uniqueness for the Cauchy problem up to the same exponent as for the incompressible Euler equations with no preassigned initial data.

Theorem 1.1. *Let $e : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a positive smooth function. Then, for any $\theta < \frac{1}{16}$ there exist infinitely many $v_0 \in C^{0,\theta}(\mathbb{T}^3; \mathbb{R}^3)$ satisfying $e(0) = \int_{\mathbb{T}^3} |v_0|^2$ and each being the initial datum of infinitely many $(v, p) \in C^0(\mathbb{T}^3 \times [0, 1]; \mathbb{R}^3 \times \mathbb{R})$ solving (1.1) and satisfying*

$$|v(x, t) - v(x', t)| \leq C|x - x'|^\theta, \quad \forall x, x' \in \mathbb{T}^3, t \in [0, T]$$

$$\int_{\mathbb{T}^3} |v(x, t)|^2 dx = e(t), \quad \forall t \in [0, T].$$

In particular, for the same reasons as in the case of dissipative L^∞ weak solutions, whenever e is nonincreasing then the initial data v_0 for which Theorem 1.1 holds cannot be too regular.

The underlying ideas of the method used in the proof of Theorem 1.1 are the ones introduced in [DLS07] and used as well in [DLS10], [DLS12] and [DLS12H]. Besides considerably improving the previous results, the approach introduced by De Lellis and Székelyhidi was new in this field and revealed unexpected connections between non-uniqueness phenomena appearing in some geometric problems –named by Gromov instances of the *h-principle* [Gro86]– and non-uniqueness in PDE problems. In particular, the Onsager's conjecture has striking similarities with the rigidity and flexibility properties of isometric embeddings of Riemannian manifolds, first explored in the celebrated works of Nash [Nash54] and Kuiper [Kui55] (on this topic see [CDLS12] and the survey [DLS11]).

As in Nash and Kuiper's papers, the solutions of the Euler equations are generated by an iteration scheme. The iteration starts with a “subsolution” to the problem, that in [DLS12] and [DLS12H] is given by a solution of a perturbation of the Euler system (called Euler-Reynolds system) satisfying a suitable strict energy inequality w.r.t. a prescribed total kinetic energy e . The definition of subsolution is s.t. a solution of the Euler-Reynolds system whose perturbation term –which is called *Reynolds stress tensor*– is identically zero and for which the energy inequality holds as an equality is a solution of the Euler equations with total kinetic energy e . Then, at each step of the iteration one finds a new subsolution, by adding to the given velocity field a suitable fast oscillating perturbation plus a small corrector term that makes the new velocity field satisfy the Euler-Reynolds system. Moreover, the type of perturbation is s.t., if the oscillation parameters are large enough, then both the new velocity field and the pressure are arbitrarily close in C^0 to the previous ones and both the C^0 norm of the new Reynolds stress and the gap in the new energy inequality can be made arbitrarily small. If the oscillation parameters are chosen big enough, then the sequence of subsolutions converge in C^0 to a solution of the Euler system with total kinetic energy e . In [DLS12H] the authors are also able to control in the iteration process the growth of the C^1 norms in such a way to get, by interpolation, that the limiting vector field belongs to $C^{0,\theta}$ for a fixed $\theta < \frac{1}{10}$. The building blocks of the main perturbation term are Beltrami flows, a special class of stationary oscillatory solutions to the Euler equations, and the initial subsolution used to start the iteration is the trivial one.

In our paper we use the same type of iteration scheme and estimates but modifying the notion of subsolution in order to include the information on the initial datum $\int |v(0)|^2 = e(0)$ (see Definition 6.2) and modifying as well the perturbations so as to leave the initial datum unchanged during the iteration procedure. This is done multiplying the perturbed Beltrami flows and their correction terms by suitable

time dependent cut-off functions (see Section 4). With the same “time-localization” trick, i.e. using the same type of iterative perturbation scheme but different cut-off functions, we also prove that there exist infinitely many nontrivial subsolutions (see Proposition 6.1), hence infinitely many “non-uniqueness initial data” –that we call *admissible initial data*– as in Theorem 1.1. The fact that the solutions and subsolutions so obtained are infinitely many is a consequence of this general iterative perturbation scheme.

In Section 8 we deal with continuous solutions of (1.1), namely no Hölder regularity is required. In this particular case we are able to provide, for the proof of Theorem 1.1, a notion of subsolution which is much less rigid than in the Hölder case. Since during the iteration procedure it is not necessary to keep under precise control the rate of growth of the C^1 norms, the strict energy inequality that we require in this case is less restrictive than in [DLS12] and [DLS12H]. Our notion of subsolution in this case is analogous, apart from the information on the initial data, to the one introduced in [Cho12].

For other non-uniqueness results in other partial differential equations obtained along the ideas first introduced in [DLS07] see e.g. [Chi12], [CFG11], [Shv11], [Sz11] and the survey [DLS11]. Another application of these methods is to the existence of global weak solutions of the Euler equations with bounded energy, though discontinuous at $t = 0$, proved in [Wie11].

1.1. Structure of the paper. In Section 2 we introduce the Euler-Reynolds system (2.1) and state Proposition 2.2, which is the building block of the generic iteration step in the proof of Theorem 1.1. Given a solution of the Euler-Reynolds system satisfying suitable conditions on the gap between its total kinetic energy and a given positive function e and moreover on the C^0 norm of its Reynolds stress, one can perturb it on an arbitrary time subinterval thus getting another solution of the Euler-Reynolds system with a smaller energy gap and C^0 norm of the Reynolds stress tensor. The localization in time is represented by the multiplication of the perturbation by a smooth function ψ with values in $[0, 1]$. Moreover, the velocity and pressure fields of the new solution are arbitrarily close in C^0 to the previous ones, with closeness parameters of the same order of the ones for the energy gap. In the mean time, also the growth of the C^1 norms of both the velocity and the Reynolds stress tensor can be controlled by suitable powers of the C^1 -norms of the previous ones, of the C^0 closeness parameters and of the C^2 norm of ψ . In Corollary 2.3, we show that imposing suitable bounds for the derivatives of ψ we can make all the estimates just dependent on the support of ψ and not on its values, thus justifying the idea of a *localized* perturbation.

In Section 3 we recall some definitions and analytic estimates from [DLS12] and [DLS12H] which are preliminary to the proof of Proposition 2.2.

In Section 4 we define the perturbed solutions of the Euler-Reynolds system as in Proposition 2.2, and in Section 5.1 we prove the related C^0 , C^1 and energy estimates.

In Section 6 we define and prove the existence of infinitely many *admissible initial data*, namely of Hölder continuous vector fields starting from which there exist infinitely many Hölder *admissible subsolutions* (see Definition 6.2).

Section 7 contains the proof of the main Theorem 1.1. More precisely, we prove that for any admissible subsolution w.r.t. a given total kinetic energy e there exist infinitely many solutions of (1.1) with the same initial datum and total kinetic energy e .

Section 8 gives another proof of Theorem 1.1 for continuous solutions of 1.1. In this case, though the basic ideas of the construction are the same, the estimates are simpler since we do not need to control in a quantitative way the growth of the C^1 norms. Moreover, it is worth noticing that the concept of admissible subsolution (see Definition 8.1) is much more flexible than in the Hölder case (see Definition 6.2), since for example it does not require such a rigid relation between the elements of the sequence of C^0 -closeness parameters $\{\delta_n\}$.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The author warmly thanks Camillo De Lellis for having proposed the problem and for fruitful discussions.

1.2. Notation. If $f : \mathbb{T}^3 \times [a_1, a_2] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ is continuous, then for all $t \in [a_1, a_2]$ define $f(t) : \mathbb{T}^3 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ as $f(t)(x) = f(x, t)$ and $\|f(t)\|_0 = \sup_{x \in \mathbb{T}^3} |f(x, t)|$. When clear from the context we will omit writing

the time variable and set f , $\|f\|_0$ instead of $f(t)$, $\|f(t)\|_0$. Thus, the symbol $\|f\|$ will denote also the time-dependent map giving the supremum norms w.r.t. the spatial variables $[a_1, a_2] \ni t \mapsto \|f(t)\|_0 \in \mathbb{R}$.

Analogously, for every $r \in \mathbb{N}$ we denote by $\|f\|_r$ the time-dependent C^r norm of f , and for any $r > 0$ which is not an integer its Hölder $C^{[r], r-[r]}$ norm. The spatial Hölder r -seminorms of f will be denoted by $[f]_r$. We also set, for $r \in \mathbb{N}$

$$\|f\|_r := \sup_{y \in \mathbb{T}^3} |D_{t,x}^r f(y, t)|, \quad \forall t \in [a_1, a_2],$$

where $D_{t,x}^r f$ are the mixed derivatives of order r in t, x and

$$\|f\|_{C^r} := \sup_{t \in [a_1, a_2]} \|f\|_r,$$

$$\|f\|_{C^0} := \sup_{t \in [a_1, a_2]} \|f\|_0,$$

$$\|f\|_{C^\alpha} := \sup_{t \in [a_1, a_2]} \|f\|_\alpha.$$

In the same way, with $\int_{\mathbb{T}^3} f$ or simply $\int f$ we will denote the time-dependent map $[a_1, a_2] \ni t \mapsto \int_{\mathbb{T}^3} f(x, t) dx$, being dx the Lebesgue measure on \mathbb{T}^3 with $\int_{\mathbb{T}^3} dx = (2\pi)^3$.

For $A \subset \mathbb{S}^2$, $\text{int } A$ denotes its interior in the relative topology induced by \mathbb{R}^3 on \mathbb{S}^2 . A set $A \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ is symmetric if $A = -A$.

We let $\mathcal{S}^{3 \times 3}$ be the space of symmetric matrices acting on \mathbb{R}^3 , $\mathcal{S}_+^{3 \times 3}$ the subset of those which are positive definite and $\mathcal{S}_0^{3 \times 3}$ the symmetric matrices with trace 0. We also define

$$\mathbb{M}_3 := \left\{ \text{Id} - b \otimes b : b \in \mathbb{S}^2 \right\}$$

and the open set

$$\mathcal{M}_3 := \text{int} \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^m a_i M_i : a_i > 0, M_i \in \mathbb{M}_3, m \in \mathbb{N} \right\}.$$

Recall the following characterization of \mathcal{M}_3 from [Cho12]

$$R \in \mathcal{M}_3 \Leftrightarrow \frac{\text{tr} R}{2} \text{Id} - R \in \mathcal{S}_+^{3 \times 3}. \quad (1.3)$$

By (1.3) or by Lemma 3.2 of [DLS12] we have that

$$\exists r_0 > 0 \text{ s.t. } B_{r_0}(\text{Id}) \subset \mathcal{M}_3. \quad (1.4)$$

2. MAIN PERTURBATION STEP

Definition 2.1. Let $(v, p, \mathring{R}) \in C^1(\mathbb{T}^3 \times (a_1, a_2); \mathbb{R}^3 \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathcal{S}_0^{3 \times 3})$. They solve the *Euler-Reynolds system* if they satisfy

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t v + \text{div}(v \otimes v) + \nabla p = \text{div } \mathring{R} \\ \text{div } v = 0 \end{cases} \quad (2.1)$$

on $\mathbb{T}^3 \times (a_1, a_2)$. The trace free matrix field \mathring{R} is called *Reynolds stress tensor*.

Proposition 2.2. Let $e \in C^\infty([a_1, a_2]; \mathbb{R}^+)$. Then $\exists \eta, M > 0$ depending on e such that the following holds. Let $(v, p, \mathring{R}) \in C^1(\mathbb{T}^3 \times [a_1, a_2]; \mathbb{R}^3 \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathcal{S}_0^{3 \times 3})$ be a solution of (2.1), $0 < \beta \leq \frac{1}{2}$, $0 < \hat{\delta} = (\delta')^{\frac{3}{2}} = (\delta'')^{\frac{3}{4}} \leq 1$ and $\varphi, \phi \in C^\infty([a_1, a_2]; [0, 1])$ such that, setting

$$\mathring{\delta} := \phi^2 \delta' + (1 - \phi^2) \delta'' \quad (2.2)$$

$$\delta^* := \varphi^2 \hat{\delta} + (1 - \varphi^2) \mathring{\delta} \quad (2.3)$$

then

$$\left| e - \int_{\mathbb{T}^3} |v|^2 - \delta^* e \right| \leq \frac{\beta}{2} \delta^* e, \quad (2.4)$$

$$\|\mathring{R} - (1 - \varphi^2) \mathring{R}'\|_0 \leq \chi_{\{\varphi > 0\}} \eta \hat{\delta}, \quad \|\mathring{R}'\|_0 \leq \eta \mathring{\delta} \quad (2.5)$$

$\forall t \in [a_1, a_2]$, for some $\mathring{R}' \in C^1(\mathbb{T}^3 \times [a_1, a_2]; \mathcal{S}_0^{3 \times 3})$.

Let $\bar{\delta} < \min \left\{ \frac{1}{2}\hat{\delta}, \hat{\delta}^{\frac{3}{2}} \right\}$, $0 < \varepsilon < 1$, $\bar{C} > 1$, $\psi \in C^\infty([a_1, a_2]; [0, 1])$.

Then $\exists 0 \leq \ell < \frac{a_2 - a_1}{2}$ and $(v_1, p_1, \mathring{R}_1) \in C^1(\mathbb{T}^3 \times [a_1 + \ell, a_2 - \ell]; \mathbb{R}^3 \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathcal{S}_0^{3 \times 3})$ which solves (2.1) and satisfies, for all $t \in [a_1 + \ell, a_2 - \ell]$:

$$v_1 = v + \psi w_1 \quad (2.6)$$

$$\mathring{R}_1 = (1 - \psi^2)\mathring{R} + \psi \mathring{R}_{1,1} + \psi' \mathring{R}_{1,2} \quad (2.7)$$

$$p_1 = p + \psi p_o \quad (2.8)$$

together with the following estimates

$$\left| e - \int_{\mathbb{T}^3} |v_1|^2 - \left[\psi^2 \bar{\delta} e + (1 - \psi^2) \left(e - \int_{\mathbb{T}^3} |v|^2 \right) \right] \right| \leq \psi \frac{\beta}{2} \bar{\delta} e \quad (2.9)$$

$$\|v_1 - v\|_0 \leq \psi M \sqrt{\delta^*} \quad (2.10)$$

$$\| |v_1 - v| \|_1 \leq \psi A_1 \hat{\delta}^{\frac{3}{2}} \left(\frac{D}{\delta^2} \right)^{1+\varepsilon} \bar{\delta}^{-\frac{17}{27} - \frac{4}{9}\varepsilon} + |\psi'| \frac{A_1}{C} \sqrt{\delta^*} \quad (2.11)$$

$$\|p_1 - p\|_0 \leq \psi M^2 \delta^* \quad (2.12)$$

$$\|\psi \mathring{R}_{1,1}\|_0 \leq \psi \frac{\eta}{2} \bar{\delta} \quad (2.13)$$

$$\|\psi' \mathring{R}_{1,2}\|_0 \leq |\psi'| \frac{\eta}{2C} \bar{\delta}^{\frac{28}{27} + \frac{4}{9}\varepsilon} \quad (2.14)$$

$$\| |\psi \mathring{R}_{1,1}| \|_1 \leq \psi A_1 \hat{\delta}^{\frac{3}{2} + \varepsilon} \left(\frac{D}{\delta^2} \right)^{1+\varepsilon} \bar{\delta}^{\frac{7}{27} - \frac{4}{9}\varepsilon} + |\psi'| \frac{1}{C} \bar{\delta}^{\frac{28}{27}} \quad (2.15)$$

$$\| |\psi' \mathring{R}_{1,2}| \|_1 \leq |\psi'| \frac{A_1}{C} \hat{\delta}^{\frac{3}{2} + \frac{3}{4}\varepsilon} \left(\frac{D}{\delta^2} \right)^{1+\varepsilon} \bar{\delta}^{\frac{7}{27} + \frac{\varepsilon}{6}} + |\psi''| \frac{A_1}{C^2} \bar{\delta}^{\frac{28}{27} + \frac{4}{9}\varepsilon} \quad (2.16)$$

where $A_1 = A_1(\varepsilon, e, \|v\|_{C^0})$ and

$$D := \max \left\{ 1, \|v\|_{C^1}, \|\mathring{R}\|_{C^1} \right\}. \quad (2.17)$$

Corollary 2.3. Let us assume that $0 < \varepsilon < \frac{7}{12}$ and the cut-off function ψ of Proposition 2.2 satisfies

$$|\psi'| \leq \bar{C} (\delta')^{-\frac{3}{4}\varepsilon}, \quad |\psi''| \leq \bar{C}^2 (\delta')^{-\frac{3}{2}\varepsilon}. \quad (2.18)$$

Then,

$$\| |v_1 - v| \|_1 \leq \chi_{\{\psi > 0\}} A_1 \hat{\delta}^{\frac{3}{2}} \left(\frac{D}{\delta^2} \right)^{1+\varepsilon} \bar{\delta}^{-\frac{17}{27} - \frac{4}{9}\varepsilon} \quad (2.19)$$

$$\|\mathring{R}_1 - (1 - \psi^2)\mathring{R}\|_0 \leq \chi_{\{\psi > 0\}} \eta \bar{\delta} \quad (2.20)$$

$$\| |\mathring{R}_1 - (1 - \psi^2)\mathring{R}| \|_1 \leq \chi_{\{\psi > 0\}} A_1 \hat{\delta}^{\frac{3}{2}} \left(\frac{D}{\delta^2} \right)^{1+\varepsilon} \quad (2.21)$$

If moreover $\varphi \equiv 1$ (or equivalently $\delta^* \equiv \hat{\delta}$) one can replace (2.19) with the better estimate

$$\| |v_1 - v| \|_1 \leq \chi_{\{\psi > 0\}} A_1 \hat{\delta}^{\frac{3}{2}} \left(\frac{D}{\delta^2} \right)^{1+\varepsilon} \quad (2.22)$$

Remark 2.4. Notice that if both $\varphi = \psi \equiv 1$, then the statements of Proposition 2.2 are the same as in Proposition 2.2 of [DLS12H].

3. PRELIMINARY GEOMETRIC AND ANALYTIC FACTS

We define now the linear space of stationary solutions of the Euler equations which will be used to construct the main perturbations to the subsolutions of the Euler equations, namely the so called *Beltrami flows*. We recall the following Proposition from [DLS12].

Proposition 3.1. Let $\lambda_0 \geq 1$ and let $A_k \in \mathbb{R}^3$ s.t.

$$A_k \cdot k = 0, \quad |A_k| = 1, \quad A_{-k} = A_k,$$

for $k \in \mathbb{Z}^3$ with $|k| = \lambda_0$. Let

$$B_k = A_k + i \frac{k}{|k|} \otimes A_k.$$

Then, for any $a_k \in \mathbb{C}$ such that $a_{-k} = \overline{a_k}$ the vector field

$$W(\xi) = \sum_{|k|=\lambda_0} a_k B_k e^{ik \cdot \xi} \quad (3.1)$$

is real valued as well as its tensor product $W \otimes W$ and it satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} \operatorname{div} W &= 0, \quad \operatorname{div} (W \otimes W) = \nabla \left(\frac{|W|^2}{2} \right), \\ \int W \otimes W &= \sum_{|k|=\lambda_0} |a_k|^2 \left(\operatorname{Id} - \frac{k}{|k|} \otimes \frac{k}{|k|} \right). \end{aligned}$$

The following geometric Lemma is a refinement made in [Cho12] of Lemma 3.2 of [DLS12H].

Lemma 3.2. *Let $N \geq 1$ and \mathcal{N} an open set s.t. $\overline{\mathcal{N}} \subset \mathcal{M}_3$. Then, there exists $\lambda_0 > 1$, pairwise disjoint and symmetric sets*

$$\Lambda_j \subset \{k \in \mathbb{Z}^3 : |k| = \lambda_0\}, \quad j = 1, \dots, N$$

and positive smooth functions

$$\gamma_k^{(j)} \in C^\infty(\mathcal{N}), \quad k \in \Lambda_j, \quad j = 1, \dots, N$$

such that $\gamma_k^{(j)} = \gamma_{-k}^{(j)}$ and

$$R = \sum_{k \in \Lambda_j} \left(\gamma_k^{(j)}(R) \right)^2 \left(\operatorname{Id} - \frac{k}{|k|} \otimes \frac{k}{|k|} \right), \quad \forall R \in \mathcal{N}, \quad j = 1, \dots, N.$$

While constructing the perturbations one also needs (as in Section 4.1 of [DLS12]) to introduce suitable partitions of unity on \mathbb{R}^3 in order to discretize the space of velocities. These partitions of unity depend on an integer parameter μ which, roughly speaking, as it increases improves the accuracy of the discretization.

Let \mathcal{C}_j , $j = 1, \dots, 8$ be the equivalence classes of \mathbb{Z}^3 w.r.t. the equivalence relation $l - l' \in (2\mathbb{Z})^3$, and let $\{a_k\}_{k \in \mathbb{Z}^3} \subset C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^3; [0, 1])$ be a smooth partition of unity of \mathbb{R}^3 –namely, $\sum_k (a_k(v))^2 \equiv 1$ – s.t. $\operatorname{supp} a_k \subset \operatorname{int} B_1(k)$. For $\mu \in \mathbb{N}$, $k \in \mathbb{Z}^3$ and $j = 1, \dots, 8$ define then the functions

$$\phi_{k,\mu}^{(j)}(v, \tau) := \sum_{l \in \mathcal{C}_j} \alpha_l(\mu v) e^{-i \frac{k \cdot l}{\mu} \tau}, \quad v \in \mathbb{R}^3, \quad \tau \in [0, +\infty).$$

We report in the following proposition the derivative estimates on the functions $\phi_k^{(j)} = \phi_k^{(j)}(v, \tau)$ given in Proposition 4.2 of [DLS12H], where v is considered as an independent variable in \mathbb{R}^3 . Let us first introduce the seminorms

$$[\cdot]_{m,R} = [\cdot]_{C^r(B_R(0) \times [a_1+\ell, a_2-\ell])}.$$

Proposition 3.3. *There are constants C depending only on $m \in \mathbb{N}$ such that the following estimates hold*

$$[\phi_{k,\mu}^{(j)}]_{m,R} + R^{-1} [\partial_\tau \phi_{k,\mu}^{(j)}]_{m,R} + R^{-2} [\partial_\tau^2 \phi_{k,\mu}^{(j)}]_{m,R} \leq C \mu^m \quad (3.2)$$

$$[\partial_\tau \phi_{k,\mu}^{(j)} + i(k \cdot v) \phi_{k,\mu}^{(j)}]_{m,R} \leq C \mu^{m-1} \quad (3.3)$$

$$R^{-1} [\partial_\tau (\partial_\tau \phi_{k,\mu}^{(j)} + i(k \cdot v) \phi_{k,\mu}^{(j)})]_{m,R} \leq C \mu^{m-1}. \quad (3.4)$$

Then we recall the elliptic operators which are used in [DLS12] and [DLS12H] to define the corrector terms to the main perturbations of a given subsolution.

Definition 3.4 (Leray projector). For any $v \in C^\infty(\mathbb{T}^3; \mathbb{R}^3)$, set

$$\mathcal{Q}v := \nabla \phi + \int_{\mathbb{T}^3} v,$$

where $\phi \in C^\infty(\mathbb{T}^3)$ is the solution to $\nabla \phi = \operatorname{div} v$ in \mathbb{T}^3 with $\int_{\mathbb{T}^3} \phi = 0$. We denote by $\mathcal{P} = \operatorname{Id} - \mathcal{Q}$ the *Leray projector* onto divergence-free vector fields with zero average.

Definition 3.5 (The operator \mathcal{R}). For any $v \in C^\infty(\mathbb{T}^3; \mathbb{R}^3)$ we define $\mathcal{R}v \in C^\infty(\mathbb{T}^3; \mathcal{S}^{3 \times 3})$ as

$$\mathcal{R}v = \frac{1}{2}(\nabla \mathcal{P}u + (\nabla \mathcal{P}u)^T) + \frac{3}{2}(\nabla u + (\nabla u)^T) - \frac{1}{2}(\operatorname{div} u)\operatorname{Id},$$

where $u \in C^\infty(\mathbb{T}^3; \mathbb{R}^3)$ is the solution to

$$\Delta u = v - \int_{\mathbb{T}^3} v, \quad \int_{\mathbb{T}^3} u = 0.$$

By the following lemma, the operator \mathcal{R} acts on divergence free vector fields as an inverse of the divergence operator.

Lemma 3.6 ([DLS12], Lemma 4.3). For any $v \in C^\infty(\mathbb{T}^3; \mathbb{R}^3)$, $\mathcal{R}v \in \mathcal{S}_0^{3 \times 3}$ and $\operatorname{div} \mathcal{R}v = v - \int_{\mathbb{T}^3} v$.

Finally, we state the following simple Lemma, which will be used in the proof of the main perturbation step (Proposition 2.2).

Lemma 3.7. Let $a, b \in (0, 1]$, $a \leq b$. Then, the function $g : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ given by

$$g(s) = \frac{sa + (1 - s^2)b}{s^2a + (1 - s^2)b}$$

satisfies the bounds

$$1 \leq g(s) \leq \frac{5}{4}.$$

Proof. One can easily check that $g \geq 1 = g(0) = g(1)$ and that $\max_{[0,1]} g$ is attained at the point $f(a, b) :=$

$\frac{\sqrt{b}}{\sqrt{b} + \sqrt{a}}$ and is given by

$$g(f(a, b)) = 1 + \frac{a}{2\sqrt{b}(\sqrt{a} + \sqrt{b})}.$$

Finally, $\max_{a \leq b} g(f(a, b)) = g(f(b, b)) = \frac{5}{4}$. □

We now recall some preliminary Hölder and Schauder estimates from [DLS12H]. As in [DLS12H] we will denote the constants which appear in the estimates with the letter C , eventually adding some subscripts according to the following rules.

- C without subscripts denote universal constants;
- C_h denote constants appearing in standard Hölder inequalities in spaces C^r . The dependence on r is omitted, since $r \geq 0$ will be fixed, even though quite large, at the end of the construction;
- C_e are constants which depend on the upper and lower bounds for e ;
- C_v constants which may depend not only on the upper and lower bounds for e but also on the supremum norm of v , i.e. $\|v\|_{C^0}$;
- $C_s, C_{e,s}, C_{v,s}$ are constants involved in Schauder estimates for $C^{m+\alpha}$ -norms of elliptic operators, which usually degenerate as α tends to 0 or 1. The ones denoted by $C_{e,s}, C_{v,s}$ depend also respectively on the upper and lower bounds for e and on $\|v\|_{C^0}$.

The above constants might also depend on ε or ω but never on $\mu, \lambda, \ell, \psi, \phi, \varphi, \hat{\delta}, \bar{\delta}, \delta', \delta''$ and D .

We recall from [DLS12] the following elliptic estimates for the operators defined in 3.4 and 3.5.

Proposition 3.8 (Schauder estimates). For any $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ and any $m \in \mathbb{N}$ there exists a constant C_s such that

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathcal{Q}v\|_{m+\alpha} &\leq C_s \|v\|_{m+\alpha}; \\ \|\mathcal{P}v\|_{m+\alpha} &\leq C_s \|v\|_{m+\alpha}; \\ \|\mathcal{R}v\|_{m+1+\alpha} &\leq C_s \|v\|_{m+\alpha}; \\ \|\mathcal{R}(\operatorname{div} A)\|_{m+\alpha} &\leq C_s \|A\|_{m+\alpha}; \\ \|\mathcal{R}\mathcal{Q}(\operatorname{div} A)\|_{m+\alpha} &\leq C_s \|A\|_{m+\alpha}. \end{aligned} \tag{3.5}$$

When the above operators are applied to the product of smooth vector fields and highly oscillating trigonometric functions we get the following estimates (see Propositions 5.2 in [DLS12] and 4.4. in [DLS12H])

Proposition 3.9. *Let $k \in \mathbb{Z}^3 \setminus \{0\}$ and $\lambda \geq 1$. Then, for any $a \in C^\infty(\mathbb{T}^3)$ and $m \in \mathbb{N}$ we have*

$$\left| \int a(x) e^{i\lambda k \cdot x} dx \right| \leq \frac{[a]_m}{\lambda^m}. \quad (3.6)$$

For any $F \in C^\infty(\mathbb{T}^3; \mathbb{R}^3)$, let $F_\lambda := F(x) e^{i\lambda k \cdot x}$. Then we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathcal{R}(F_\lambda)\|_\alpha &\leq \frac{C_s}{\lambda^{1-\alpha}} \|F\|_0 + \frac{C_s}{\lambda^{m-\alpha}} [F]_m + \frac{C_s}{\lambda^m} [F]_{m+\alpha}, \\ \|\mathcal{R}\mathcal{Q}(F_\lambda)\|_\alpha &\leq \frac{C_s}{\lambda^{1-\alpha}} \|F\|_0 + \frac{C_s}{\lambda^{m-\alpha}} [F]_m + \frac{C_s}{\lambda^m} [F]_{m+\alpha}. \end{aligned}$$

4. CONSTRUCTION OF THE MAPS v_1 , p_1 AND \mathring{R}_1

As in [DLS12] and [DLS12H], the idea to construct v_1 is to perturb v with a fast oscillating time-dependent ‘‘patching’’ of Beltrami flows w_o and then adding a smaller perturbation term w_c so that $w_1 = w_o + w_c$ satisfies the divergence free constraint. However, in this case both perturbations are multiplied by the cut-off function ψ . Also the perturbation terms of the pressure will be modified accordingly, and the Reynolds stress tensor \mathring{R}_1 will be defined as in [DLS12H] using the elliptic ‘‘ \mathcal{R} operator’’ (see Definition 3.5).

Given (v, p, \mathring{R}) , φ , ϕ , $\hat{\delta}$, δ' , δ'' as in Proposition 2.2, we fix ε , ψ , \bar{C} , $\bar{\delta}$, ℓ as in the main statement, with ℓ satisfying also

$$D\ell \leq \eta \bar{\delta}. \quad (4.1)$$

The perturbations will also depend on two parameters λ, μ s.t.

$$\lambda, \mu, \frac{\lambda}{\mu} \in \mathbb{N}. \quad (4.2)$$

In order to simplify calculations, we assume from now onwards the following inequalities, which will be consistent with the choice of parameters we make in Section 5.5 to get the estimates of Proposition 2.2.

$$\mu \geq (\delta^*)^{-1} \geq 1, \quad \lambda \geq \max\left\{(\mu D)^{1+\omega}, \ell^{-(1+\omega)}\right\}, \quad (4.3)$$

where

$$\omega = \frac{\varepsilon}{2 + \varepsilon}. \quad (4.4)$$

4.1. Mollifications. Let $\chi \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^3 \times \mathbb{R})$ be a nonnegative radial kernel supported in $[-1, 1]^4$ and define

$$\begin{aligned} \chi_\ell(x, t) &= \frac{1}{\ell^4} \chi\left(\frac{x}{\ell}, \frac{t}{\ell}\right), \\ v_\ell(x, t) &= \int_{\mathbb{T}^3 \times [-1, 1]} v(x - y, t - s) \chi_\ell(y, s) dy ds, \\ \mathring{R}_\ell(t, x) &= \int_{\mathbb{T}^3 \times [-1, 1]} \mathring{R}(x - y, t - s) \chi_\ell(y, s) dy ds. \end{aligned}$$

Notice that v_ℓ and \mathring{R}_ℓ are well defined on $\mathbb{T}^3 \times [a_1 + \ell, a_2 - \ell]$. That is why we require $\ell < \frac{a_2 - a_1}{2}$. Moreover

$$\|v_\ell - v\|_0 + \|\mathring{R}_\ell - \mathring{R}\|_0 \leq CD\ell, \quad (4.5)$$

$$\|v_\ell\|_r + \|\mathring{R}_\ell\|_r \leq C(r) D\ell^{1-r}, \quad r \geq 1, \quad (4.6)$$

for all $t \in [a_1 + \ell, a_2 - \ell]$.

As a consequence, since $\|v_\ell\|^2 - |v|^2 \leq |v - v_\ell|^2 + 2|v - v_\ell||v|$ and (4.1) holds

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\mathbb{T}^3} \|v_\ell\|^2 - |v|^2 &\leq C(D\ell)^2 + CD\ell\sqrt{\varepsilon} \\ &\leq C\eta\bar{\delta} \left(\max_{s \in [a_1, a_2]} e(s)^{1/2} + 1 \right). \end{aligned} \quad (4.7)$$

4.2. Construction of v_1 . We define v_1 adding to v two perturbations as in [DLS12] and [DLS12H], but localized by the cut-off function ψ , namely

$$v_1 = v + \psi w_o + \psi w_c, \quad (4.8)$$

with w_o and w_c defined as in Section 3 of [DLS12H]. Then we set

$$w_1 := w_o + w_c.$$

The main perturbation term is w_o , while w_c is a corrector term that makes v_1 divergence free and it is given by

$$w_c = -\mathcal{Q}w_o, \quad (4.9)$$

where $\mathcal{Q} = \text{Id} - \mathcal{P}$ and \mathcal{P} is the Leray projection operator as in Definition 3.4.

4.2.1. Construction of w_o . Define, for $(x, t) \in \mathbb{T}^3 \times [a_1 + \ell, a_2 - \ell]$

$$\begin{aligned} \rho_\ell(t) &= \frac{1}{3(2\pi)^3} \left(e(t)(1 - \bar{\delta}) - \int_{\mathbb{T}^3} |v_\ell|^2(x, t) dx \right), \\ R_\ell(x, t) &= \rho_\ell(t) \text{Id} - \mathring{R}_\ell(x, t). \end{aligned}$$

Provided $\frac{R_\ell}{\rho_\ell} \in \mathcal{N}$, with \mathcal{N} satisfying the assumptions of Lemma 3.2, the main perturbation w_o on $\mathbb{T}^3 \times [a_1 + \ell, a_2 - \ell]$ can be defined as

$$w_o(x, t) := W_o(x, t, \lambda t, \lambda x) \quad (4.10)$$

where

$$W_o(y, s, \tau, \xi) := \sqrt{\rho_\ell(s)} \sum_{j=1}^8 \sum_{k \in \Lambda_j} \gamma_k^{(j)} \left(\frac{R_\ell(y, s)}{\rho_\ell(s)} \right) \phi_{k, \mu}^{(j)}(v_\ell(y, s), \tau) B_k e^{ik \cdot \xi},$$

$\gamma_k^{(j)}$, $\phi_{k, \mu}^{(j)}$ are defined in Section 3 and $B_k \in \mathbb{C}^3$ are unit vectors satisfying the assumptions of Proposition 3.1.

Lemma 4.1. *If $\eta \leq \eta(e)$, then $\frac{R_\ell}{\rho_\ell} \in B_{r_0}(\text{Id})$, with r_0 satisfying (1.4).*

Proof. By (2.5), (4.5) and (4.1)

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \frac{R_\ell}{\rho_\ell} - \text{Id} \right\|_0 &= \left\| \frac{\mathring{R}_\ell}{\rho_\ell} \right\|_0 \leq \frac{CD\ell + \|\mathring{R}\|_0}{\min_{[a_1 + \ell, a_2 - \ell]} \rho_\ell} \\ &\leq \frac{C\eta\bar{\delta} + \chi_{\{\varphi > 0\}}\eta\hat{\delta} + (1 - \varphi^2)\eta\bar{\delta}}{\min_{[a_1 + \ell, a_2 - \ell]} \rho_\ell} \\ &\leq \frac{3C\eta\delta^*}{\min_{[a_1 + \ell, a_2 - \ell]} \rho_\ell}. \end{aligned}$$

Since $\bar{\delta} \leq \frac{1}{2}\delta^*$

$$\begin{aligned} \rho_\ell(t) &\geq \frac{1}{3(2\pi)^3} \left\{ e \left(1 - \frac{\delta^*}{2} \right) - \int_{\mathbb{T}^3} |v|^2 - \int_{\mathbb{T}^3} \left(|v_\ell|^2 - |v|^2 \right) \right\} \\ &\stackrel{(2.4)(4.7)}{\geq} \frac{1}{3(2\pi)^3} \left\{ \left(\frac{1}{2} - \frac{\beta}{2} \right) \delta^* e - C\eta\bar{\delta} \left(\max_{[a_1 + \ell, a_2 - \ell]} \sqrt{e} + 1 \right) \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

and since $\beta \leq \frac{1}{2}$, if $\eta = \eta(e)$ is sufficiently small we get the lower bound

$$\rho_\ell(t) \geq \frac{C'}{3(2\pi)^3} \delta^* \quad (4.11)$$

for some constant $C' > 0$. Hence, provided $\eta < \frac{C'}{9(2\pi)^3 C}$, the lemma is proved. \square

Finally notice that, analogously to (4.11), ρ_ℓ can be estimated from above as

$$\begin{aligned}
\rho_\ell &\leq e - \int |v|^2 + \left| \int |v_\ell|^2 - |v|^2 \right| \\
&\stackrel{(2.4)}{\leq} \delta^* e + \frac{\beta}{2} \delta^* e + C\eta\bar{\delta} \left(1 + \max_{[a_1, a_2]} \sqrt{e}\right) \\
&\leq \frac{5}{4} \delta^* e + C\eta\bar{\delta} \left(1 + \max_{[a_1, a_2]} \sqrt{e}\right) \\
&\leq C' \delta^* \left(1 + \max_{[a_1, a_2]} e\right).
\end{aligned} \tag{4.12}$$

Then, since $|w_o(x, t)| \leq C\sqrt{\rho_\ell(t)}$, we can choose $M = M(e) > 1$ s.t.

$$\|w_o\|_0 \leq \frac{M}{2} \sqrt{\delta^*}. \tag{4.13}$$

4.3. Definition of p_1 . We define the pressure p_1 as

$$p_1 := p - \psi^2 \frac{|w_o|^2}{2} - \psi \frac{2\langle (v - v_\ell), w_1 \rangle}{3}.$$

By (4.13) and (4.5), provided η is sufficiently small we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\|p_1 - p\|_0 &\leq \psi^2 \frac{M^2}{4} \delta^* + C\eta\bar{\delta} \|w_1\|_0 \\
&\leq \psi^2 \frac{M^2}{4} \delta^* + \frac{3}{4} \bar{\delta} \|w_1\|_0
\end{aligned} \tag{4.14}$$

4.4. Definition of \mathring{R}_1 . According to our definitions of v_1 and p_1 , it is fairly easy to see that

$$\begin{aligned}
\partial_t v_1 + \operatorname{div}(v_1 \otimes v_1) + \nabla p_1 &= \operatorname{div}[(1 - \psi^2)\mathring{R}] \\
&\quad + \partial_t(\psi w_1) + \operatorname{div}(\psi w_1 \otimes v_\ell + v_\ell \otimes \psi w_1) \\
&\quad + \operatorname{div}\left(\psi^2 w_1 \otimes w_1 - \frac{\psi^2}{2} |w_o|^2 \operatorname{Id} + \psi^2 \mathring{R}_\ell\right) \\
&\quad + \operatorname{div}[\psi^2(\mathring{R} - \mathring{R}_\ell)] \\
&\quad + \operatorname{div}\left(\psi w_1 \otimes (v - v_\ell) + (v - v_\ell) \otimes \psi w_1 - \psi \frac{2\langle v - v_\ell, w_1 \rangle}{3} \operatorname{Id}\right)
\end{aligned}$$

Hence, recalling the Definition 3.5 of the operator \mathcal{R} , we set

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathring{R}_1 &:= (1 - \psi^2)\mathring{R} \\
&\quad + \mathcal{R}[\partial_t(\psi w_1) + \operatorname{div}(\psi w_1 \otimes v_\ell + v_\ell \otimes \psi w_1)] \\
&\quad + \mathcal{R}[\operatorname{div}\left(\psi^2 w_1 \otimes w_1 - \frac{\psi^2}{2} |w_o|^2 \operatorname{Id} + \psi^2 \mathring{R}_\ell\right)] \\
&\quad + \psi^2(\mathring{R} - \mathring{R}_\ell) \\
&\quad + \psi w_1 \otimes (v - v_\ell) + (v - v_\ell) \otimes \psi w_1 - \psi \frac{2\langle v - v_\ell, w_1 \rangle}{3} \operatorname{Id}.
\end{aligned} \tag{4.15}$$

By Lemma 3.6 and the fact that $\partial_t v_1 + \operatorname{div}(v_1 \otimes v_1) + \nabla p_1$ has zero average, it follows that $(v_1, p_1, \mathring{R}_1)$ satisfies (2.1).

5. PROOF OF THE MAIN PERTURBATION STEP

5.1. Doubling the variables and corresponding estimates. As in [DLS12H], for any $k \in \Lambda_j \subset \{|k| = \lambda_0\}$ we set

$$a_k(y, s, \tau) = \sqrt{\rho_\ell(s)} \gamma_k^{(j)} \left(\frac{R'_\ell(y, s)}{\rho_\ell(s)} \right) \phi_{k, \mu}^{(j)}(v(y, s), \tau). \tag{5.1}$$

and

$$\psi(s)W_o(y, s, \tau, \xi) = \psi(s) \sum_{j=1}^8 \sum_{k \in \Lambda_j} a_k(y, s, \tau) B_k e^{ik \cdot \xi}$$

so that our main perturbation term is given by

$$\psi(t)w_o(x, t) = \psi(t)W_o(x, t, \lambda t, \lambda x).$$

The next proposition is the analogue of Proposition 5.1 in [DLS12H]. The following estimates on the derivatives of the coefficients of the main perturbation term will be the basis for estimating also the derivatives of the other correction terms in the supremum norm.

Proposition 5.1. *Let $a_k \in C^\infty(\mathbb{T}^3 \times [a_1 + \ell, a_2 - \ell] \times \mathbb{R})$ be as in (5.1), ψ the cut-off function of Proposition 2.2 and D given by (2.17).*

Then, for any $r \geq 1$ and any $\alpha \in [0, 1]$ we have the following estimates

$$\|\psi a_k(\cdot, s, \tau)\|_r \leq \psi(s) C_e \sqrt{\delta^*} (\mu^r D^r + \mu D \ell^{1-r}) \quad (5.2)$$

$$\|\partial_\tau \psi a_k(\cdot, s, \tau)\|_r + \|\partial_\tau^2 \psi a_k(\cdot, s, \tau)\|_r \leq \psi(s) C_e \sqrt{\delta^*} (\mu^r D^r + \mu D \ell^{1-r}) \quad (5.3)$$

$$\|(\partial_\tau \psi a_k + i(k \cdot v_\ell) \psi a_k)(\cdot, s, \tau)\|_r \leq \psi(s) C_e \sqrt{\delta^*} (\mu^{r-1} D^r + D \ell^{1-r}) \quad (5.4)$$

$$\|\partial_\tau (\partial_\tau \psi a_k + i(k \cdot v_\ell) \psi a_k)(\cdot, s, \tau)\|_r \leq \psi(s) C_e \sqrt{\delta^*} (\mu^{r-1} D^r + D \ell^{1-r}) \quad (5.5)$$

$$\|\psi a_k(\cdot, s, \tau)\|_\alpha \leq \psi(s) C_e \sqrt{\delta^*} \mu^\alpha D^\alpha \quad (5.6)$$

$$\|\partial_\tau \psi a_k(\cdot, s, \tau)\|_\alpha + \|\partial_\tau^2 \psi a_k(\cdot, s, \tau)\|_\alpha \leq \psi(s) C_e \sqrt{\delta^*} \mu^\alpha D^\alpha \quad (5.7)$$

$$\|(\partial_\tau \psi a_k + i(k \cdot v_\ell) \psi a_k)(\cdot, s, \tau)\|_\alpha \leq \psi(s) C_e \sqrt{\delta^*} \mu^{\alpha-1} D^\alpha \quad (5.8)$$

$$\|\partial_\tau (\partial_\tau \psi a_k + i(k \cdot v_\ell) \psi a_k)(\cdot, s, \tau)\|_\alpha \leq \psi(s) C_e \sqrt{\delta^*} \mu^{\alpha-1} D^\alpha \quad (5.9)$$

Moreover, for any $r \geq 0$

$$\|\partial_s \psi a_k(\cdot, s, \tau)\|_r \leq \psi(s) C_e \sqrt{\delta^*} (\mu^{r+1} D^{r+1} + \mu D \ell^{-r}) + |\psi'(s)| C_e \sqrt{\delta^*} (\mu^r D^r + \mu D \ell^{1-r}) \quad (5.10)$$

$$\|\partial_{s\tau}^2 \psi a_k(\cdot, s, \tau)\|_r \leq \psi(s) C_e \sqrt{\delta^*} (\mu^{r+1} D^{r+1} + \mu D \ell^{-r}) + |\psi'(s)| C_e \sqrt{\delta^*} (\mu^r D^r + \mu D \ell^{1-r}) \quad (5.11)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \|\partial_s^2 \psi a_k(\cdot, s, \tau)\|_r &\leq \psi(s) C_e \sqrt{\delta^*} (\mu^{r+2} D^{r+2} + \mu D \ell^{-1-r}) + |\psi'(s)| C_e \sqrt{\delta^*} (\mu^{r+1} D^{r+1} + \mu D \ell^{-r}) \\ &\quad + |\psi''(s)| C_e \sqrt{\delta^*} (\mu^r D^r + \mu D \ell^{1-r}) \end{aligned} \quad (5.12)$$

$$\|\partial_s (\partial_\tau (\psi a_k + i(k \cdot v_\ell) \psi a_k)(\cdot, s, \tau))\|_r \leq \psi(s) C_e \sqrt{\delta^*} (\mu^r D^{r+1} + \mu D \ell^{-r}) + |\psi'(s)| C_e \sqrt{\delta^*} (\mu^{r-1} D^r + \mu D \ell^{1-r}). \quad (5.13)$$

We also have

$$\psi W_o \otimes \psi W_o(y, s, \tau, \xi) = \psi^2(s) R_\ell(y, s) + \psi^2(s) \sum_{1 \leq |k| \leq 2\lambda_0} U_k(y, s, \tau) e^{ik \cdot \xi}, \quad (5.14)$$

where $U_k \in C^\infty(\mathbb{T}^3 \times [a_1 + \ell, a_2 - \ell] \times \mathbb{R})$ satisfy

$$U_k k = \frac{1}{2} (\text{tr} U_k) k \quad (5.15)$$

and the following estimates for any $r \geq 0$ and any $\alpha \in [0, 1]$:

$$\|\psi^2 U_k(\cdot, s, \tau)\|_r \leq \psi^2(s) C_e \delta^* (\mu^r D^r + \mu D \ell^{1-r}) \quad (5.16)$$

$$\|\partial_\tau \psi^2 U_k(\cdot, s, \tau)\|_r \leq \psi^2(s) C_v \delta^* (\mu^r D^r + \mu D \ell^{1-r}) \quad (5.17)$$

$$\|\psi^2 U_k(\cdot, s, \tau)\|_\alpha \leq \psi^2(s) C_e \delta^* \mu^\alpha D^\alpha \quad (5.18)$$

$$\|\partial_\tau \psi^2 U_k(\cdot, s, \tau)\|_\alpha \leq \psi^2(s) C_v \delta^* \mu^\alpha D^\alpha. \quad (5.19)$$

Moreover, for any $r \geq 0$

$$\|\partial_s \psi^2 U_k(\cdot, s, \tau)\|_r \leq \psi^2(s) C_e \delta^* (\mu^{r+1} D^{r+1} + \mu D \ell^{-r}) + \psi(s) |\psi'(s)| C_e \delta^* (\mu^r D^r + \mu D \ell^{1-r}). \quad (5.20)$$

Proof. Notice that the above estimates are the same as in Proposition 5.1 of [DLS12H], up to replacing δ with δ^* everywhere and multiplying them by suitable powers of ψ and its derivatives.

As in [DLS12H] we set

$$\psi(s)a_k(y, s, \tau) = \psi(s)\sqrt{\rho_\ell(s)}\Gamma(y, s)\Phi(y, s, \tau), \quad (5.21)$$

where $\Gamma(y, s) = \gamma_k^{(j)}\left(\frac{R_\ell(y, s)}{\rho_\ell(s)}\right)$, $\Phi(y, s, \tau) = \phi_{k, \mu}^{(j)}(v_\ell(y, s), \tau)$.

By definition of U_k , it is fairly easy to see that the estimates (5.16)-(5.20) are a consequence of (5.2)-(5.5) and (5.10).

First of all, notice that in the estimates (5.2)-(5.9), since ψ does not depend on (y, τ) , we simply have to multiply the estimates for a_k by the function ψ . Analogously, in the estimates (5.10)-(5.13) we simply apply the Leibniz rule to the derivation w.r.t. s of the products ψa_k , $\psi \partial_\tau a_k$ etc. and then bring back to the estimates (5.2)-(5.9), with one (or two) order of derivation less w.r.t. y for the terms in which ψ is differentiated.

Then, we can reduce to study a_k and see why the the only change in the estimates is the replacement of the δ of [DLS12H] by δ^* . First notice that, since the only change in the definition of a_k is the choice of ρ_ℓ , after applying the Leibniz rule to (5.21) the only terms that might be changing are those containing derivatives of functions of ρ_ℓ . In particular, it is fairly easy to see that such terms are

$$|\sqrt{\rho_\ell}|, \quad |\partial_s^r \sqrt{\rho_\ell}|, \quad \|\Gamma\|_r, \quad \|\partial_s \Gamma\|_r.$$

By (4.12), we already know that $|\sqrt{\rho_\ell}| \leq C_e \sqrt{\delta^*}$, while in [DLS12H] one has $|\sqrt{\rho_\ell}| \leq C_e \sqrt{\delta}$. Moreover,

$$\begin{aligned} \|\Gamma\|_r &\leq C \left\| \frac{\dot{R}_\ell}{\rho_\ell} \right\|_r \leq C \frac{\|\dot{R}_\ell\|_r}{\min_{[a_1+\ell, a_2-\ell]} \rho_\ell} \\ &\stackrel{(4.11)}{\leq} C' \frac{D\ell^{1-r}}{\delta^*} \\ &\stackrel{(4.3)}{\leq} C' \mu D \ell^{1-r} \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \|\partial_s \Gamma\|_r &\leq C \frac{\|\partial_s \dot{R}_\ell\|_r}{\min_{[a_1+\ell, a_2-\ell]} \rho_\ell} + C \|\dot{R}_\ell\|_r |\partial_s(\rho_\ell^{-1})| \\ &\leq C \frac{D\ell^{-r}}{\delta^*} + CD\ell^{1-r} D\delta^{*-2} \\ &\leq C(\mu D\ell^{-r} + \mu^2 D^2 \ell^{1-r}) \end{aligned}$$

exactly as in [DLS12H]. Finally,

$$\begin{aligned} |\partial_s^r \sqrt{\rho_\ell}| &\leq C_h \sum_{i=1}^r C_e (\delta^*)^{\frac{1}{2}-i} |\rho_\ell|^{i-1} |\partial_s^r \rho_\ell| \\ &\leq \delta^{*- \frac{1}{2}} |\partial_s^r \rho_\ell| \leq C \delta^{*- \frac{1}{2}} D \ell^{1-r} \\ &\leq C \sqrt{\delta^*} \mu D \ell^{1-r} \end{aligned} \quad (5.22)$$

in contrast with $|\partial_s^r \sqrt{\rho_\ell}| \leq C \sqrt{\delta} \mu D \ell^{1-r}$ of [DLS12H].

Since by the Leibniz rule

$$\|\partial_s^m \partial_\tau^p a_k\|_r \leq C \sum_{i=0}^m |\partial_s^i \sqrt{\rho_\ell}| \|\partial_s^{m-i}(\Gamma(y, s) \partial_\tau^p \Phi(y, s, \tau))\|_r,$$

where $\|\partial_s^{m-i}(\Gamma(y, s) \partial_\tau^p \Phi(y, s, \tau))\|_r$ can be estimated as in [DLS12H], by (5.22) Proposition 5.1 is proved. \square

5.2. Estimates on v_1 . The estimates for the perturbation term ψw_1 are obtained as in Section 6 of [DLS12H], using the structure of w_o , the Schauder estimates for $\mathcal{Q}w_o$ of Proposition 3.8, and the estimates of Proposition 5.1.

Therefore it is fairly easy to see that the following proposition is the counterpart of Proposition 6.1 of [DLS12H].

Proposition 5.2. *The following estimates hold for all $r \geq 0$, $t \in [a_1 + \ell, a_2 - \ell]$:*

$$\|\psi w_o\|_r \leq \psi C_e \sqrt{\delta^*} \lambda^r \quad (5.23)$$

$$\|\partial_t(\psi w_o)\|_r \leq \psi C_v \sqrt{\delta^*} \lambda^{r+1} + |\psi'| C_v \sqrt{\delta^*} \lambda^r \quad (5.24)$$

and the following for any $r > 0$ which is not integer:

$$\|\psi w_c\|_r \leq \psi C_{e,s} \sqrt{\delta^*} D \mu \lambda^{r-1} \quad (5.25)$$

$$\|\partial_t(\psi w_c)\|_r \leq \psi C_{v,s} \sqrt{\delta^*} D \mu \lambda^r + |\psi'| C_{v,s} \sqrt{\delta^*} D \mu \lambda^{r-1}. \quad (5.26)$$

In particular,

$$\begin{aligned} \|v_1 - v\|_0 &= \|\psi w\|_0 \leq \psi C_e \sqrt{\delta^*}, \\ \|\partial_t(v_1 - v)\|_0 + \|v_1 - v\|_1 &= \|\partial_t(\psi w)\|_0 + \|\psi w\|_1 \leq \psi C_e \sqrt{\delta^*} \lambda + |\psi'| C_e \sqrt{\delta^*}. \end{aligned}$$

5.3. Estimates on the energy. Analogously to Proposition 7.1 of [DLS12H] we obtain the following

Proposition 5.3. *For any $\alpha \in (0, \frac{\omega}{1+\omega})$ there is a constant $C_{v,s}$, depending only on α , e and $\|v\|_{C^0}$ such that, $\forall t \in [a_1 + \ell, a_2 - \ell]$*

$$\left| e - \int_{\mathbb{T}^3} |v_1|^2 - \left[\psi^2 \bar{\delta} e + (1 - \psi^2) \left(e - \int_{\mathbb{T}^3} |v|^2 \right) \right] \right| \leq \psi^2 C_e D \ell + \psi C_{v,s} \sqrt{\delta^*} \mu D \lambda^{\alpha-1}$$

Proof. Writing $|v_1|^2$ as

$$|v_1|^2 = |v|^2 + \psi^2 |w_o|^2 + \psi^2 |w_c|^2 + 2\psi v \cdot w_o + 2\psi v \cdot w_c + 2\psi^2 w_o \cdot w_c,$$

we get

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \int_{\mathbb{T}^3} |v_1|^2 - |v|^2 - \psi^2 |w_o|^2 \right| &\leq C_v \|\psi w_c\|_0 (1 + \|\psi w_o\|_0 + \|\psi w_c\|_0) + 2\psi \left| \int_{\mathbb{T}^3} w_o \cdot v \right| \\ &\leq C_v \psi \sqrt{\delta^*} D \mu \lambda^{\alpha-1} + 2\psi \left| \int_{\mathbb{T}^3} w_o \cdot v \right| \quad (5.27) \\ &\leq C_{v,s} \psi \sqrt{\delta^*} D \mu \lambda^{\alpha-1}, \quad (5.28) \end{aligned}$$

where (5.27) follows from Proposition 5.2 and the fact that $\lambda \geq (\mu D)^{1+\omega}$ (see (4.3)), while (5.28) is a consequence of (3.6) and Proposition 5.1.

Now, tracing (5.14) we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \int_{\mathbb{T}^3} \psi^2 |w_o|^2 - \psi^2 \text{tr}(R_\ell) \right| &\leq \psi^2 \sum_{1 \leq |k| \leq 2\lambda_0} \left| \int_{\mathbb{T}^3} \text{tr} U_k \right| \\ &\leq C_e \psi^2 \delta^* \mu D \lambda^{-1}, \end{aligned}$$

the last inequality following from (3.6) with $m = 1$ and (5.16). \square

Then we conclude after observing that

$$\int_{\mathbb{T}^3} \text{tr}(R_\ell) = e(1 - \bar{\delta}) - \int_{\mathbb{T}^3} |v_\ell|^2$$

and recalling (4.7).

5.4. Estimates on the Reynolds stress. While estimating the Reynolds stress we refer to Proposition 8.1 in [DLS12H].

Proposition 5.4. *For every $\alpha \in (0, \frac{\omega}{1+\omega})$, there is a constant $C_{v,s}$ depending only on α, ω, e and $\|v\|_{C^0}$ such that the following estimates hold*

$$\|\mathring{R}_1 - (1 - \psi^2)\mathring{R}\|_0 \leq C_{v,s} [\psi D\ell + \psi\sqrt{\delta^*}\mu D\lambda^{2\alpha-1} + \psi\sqrt{\delta^*}\mu^{-1}\lambda^\alpha + |\psi'|\sqrt{\delta^*}\mu D\lambda^{\alpha-1}] \quad (5.29)$$

$$\begin{aligned} |||(\mathring{R}_1 - (1 - \psi^2)\mathring{R})|||_1 &\leq C_{v,s} [\psi\sqrt{\delta^*}\mu D\lambda^{2\alpha} + \psi\sqrt{\delta^*}\lambda D\ell + \psi\sqrt{\delta^*}\mu^{-1}\lambda^{\alpha+1} \\ &\quad + |\psi'|D\ell + |\psi'|\sqrt{\delta^*}\mu^{-1}\lambda^\alpha + |\psi'|\sqrt{\delta^*}\mu D\lambda^\alpha \\ &\quad + |\psi''|\sqrt{\delta^*}\mu D\lambda^{\alpha-1}] \end{aligned} \quad (5.30)$$

Proof. Recalling the definition of \mathring{R}_1 made in (4.15) we set

$$\mathring{R}_1 - (1 - \psi^2)\mathring{R} = \psi^2\mathring{R}_1^1 + \psi\mathring{R}_1^2 + \psi^2\mathring{R}_1^3 + \psi\mathring{R}_1^4 + \psi\mathring{R}_1^5 + \psi\mathring{R}_1^6 + \psi\mathring{R}_1^7 + \psi'\mathring{R}_1^8 \quad (5.31)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \mathring{R}_1^1 &= \mathring{R} - \mathring{R}_\ell \\ \mathring{R}_1^2 &= w_1 \otimes (v - v_\ell) + (v - v_\ell) \otimes w_1 - \frac{2\langle (v - v_\ell), w_1 \rangle}{3} \text{Id} \\ \mathring{R}_1^3 &= \mathcal{R} \left[\text{div} \left(w_o \otimes w_o + \mathring{R}_\ell - \frac{|w_o|^2}{2} \text{Id} \right) \right] \\ \mathring{R}_1^4 &= \mathcal{R}(\partial_t w_c) \\ \mathring{R}_1^5 &= \mathcal{R}[\text{div}((v_\ell + \psi w_1) \otimes w_c + w_c \otimes (v_\ell + \psi w_1) + w_c \otimes \psi w_c)] \\ \mathring{R}_1^6 &= \mathcal{R} \text{div}(w_o \otimes v_\ell) \\ \mathring{R}_1^7 &= \mathcal{R}[\partial_t w_o + v_\ell \cdot \nabla w_o] \\ \mathring{R}_1^8 &= \mathcal{R}(w_1). \end{aligned}$$

Notice that $\mathring{R}_1^1, \mathring{R}_1^2, \mathring{R}_1^3, \mathring{R}_1^4, \mathring{R}_1^5$ and \mathring{R}_1^7 are defined as in the proof of Proposition 8.1 in [DLS12H]. Therefore, taking into account the multiplications by the cut-off function ψ and the new estimates for the coefficients a_k obtained in Proposition 5.1, in the next table we collect without proof the related C^0 and C^1 -estimates.

C^0 estimates	C^1 estimates
$\ \psi^2\mathring{R}_1^1\ _0 \leq \psi^2 CD\ell$	$ \psi^2\mathring{R}_1^1 _1 \leq \psi^2 CD + \psi' CD\ell$
$\ \psi\mathring{R}_1^2\ _0 \leq \psi C_e \sqrt{\delta^*} D\ell$	$ \psi\mathring{R}_1^2 _1 \leq \psi C_v \sqrt{\delta^*} \lambda D\ell + \psi' C_e \sqrt{\delta^*} D\ell$
$\ \psi^2\mathring{R}_1^3\ _0 \leq \psi^2 C_{e,s} \delta^* \mu D\lambda^{\alpha-1}$	$ \psi^2\mathring{R}_1^3 _1 \leq \psi^2 C_{v,s} \delta^* \mu D\lambda^\alpha + \psi' C_{e,s} \delta^* \mu D\lambda^{\alpha-1}$
$\ \psi\mathring{R}_1^4\ _0 \leq \psi C_{v,s} \sqrt{\delta^*} \mu D\lambda^{\alpha-1}$	$ \psi\mathring{R}_1^4 _1 \leq \psi C_{v,s} \sqrt{\delta^*} \mu D\lambda^\alpha + \psi' C_{v,s} \sqrt{\delta^*} \mu D\lambda^{\alpha-1}$
$\ \psi\mathring{R}_1^6\ _0 \leq \psi C_{v,s} \sqrt{\delta^*} \mu D\lambda^{\alpha-1}$	$ \psi\mathring{R}_1^6 _1 \leq \psi C_{v,s} \sqrt{\delta^*} \mu D\lambda^\alpha + \psi' C_{v,s} \sqrt{\delta^*} \mu D\lambda^{\alpha-1}$
$\ \psi\mathring{R}_1^7\ _0 \leq \psi C_{v,s} \sqrt{\delta^*} (\mu D\lambda^{\alpha-1} + \mu^{-1}\lambda^\alpha)$	$ \psi\mathring{R}_1^7 _1 \leq \psi C_{v,s} \sqrt{\delta^*} (\mu D\lambda^\alpha + \mu^{-1}\lambda^{\alpha+1})$ $+ \psi' C_{v,s} \sqrt{\delta^*} (\mu D\lambda^{\alpha-1} + \mu^{-1}\lambda^\alpha)$

Moreover, reasoning exactly as in Step 5 of the proof of Proposition 8.1 in [DLS12H] we get

$$\begin{aligned} &\stackrel{(3.5)}{\leq} \|(v_\ell + \psi w_1) \otimes w_c + w_c \otimes (v_\ell + \psi w_1) + w_c \otimes \psi w_c\|_\alpha \\ &\leq C_h \|w_c\|_\alpha (\|v_\ell\|_0 + \psi \|w_o\|_\alpha + \psi \|w_c\|_\alpha) \\ &\stackrel{\text{Prop. 5.1}}{\leq} C_{v,s} \sqrt{\delta^*} \mu D\lambda^{2\alpha-1}. \end{aligned}$$

and the same argument gives

$$|||\psi\mathring{R}_1^5|||_1 \leq \psi C_{v,s} \sqrt{\delta^*} \mu D\lambda^{2\alpha} + |\psi'|C_{v,s} \sqrt{\delta^*} \mu D\lambda^{2\alpha-1}.$$

Concerning $\psi' \mathring{R}_1^8$, recall that

$$w_c = \frac{1}{\lambda} \mathcal{Q}u_c, \quad u_c := \sum_{|k|=\lambda_0} i \nabla a_k(x, t, \lambda t) \times \frac{k \times B_k}{|k|^2} e^{i\lambda x \cdot k},$$

apply Propositions 3.9 and 5.1 and get

$$\begin{aligned} \|\psi' \mathring{R}_1^8\|_0 &\leq |\psi'| C_s \sum_{|k|=\lambda_0} \left[\frac{1}{\lambda^{1-\alpha}} \|a_k\|_0 + \frac{1}{\lambda^{m-\alpha}} [a_k]_m + \frac{1}{\lambda^m} [a_k]_{m+\alpha} \right] \\ &+ |\psi'| C_s \sum_{|k|=\lambda_0} \left[\frac{1}{\lambda^{2-\alpha}} \|a_k\|_1 + \frac{1}{\lambda^{m+1-\alpha}} [a_k]_{m+1} + \frac{1}{\lambda^{m+1}} [a_k]_{m+1+\alpha} \right]. \\ &\leq |\psi'| C_{v,s} \sqrt{\delta^*} \lambda^{\alpha-1} \left[1 + \lambda^{1-m} ((\mu D)^m + \mu D \ell^{1-m}) + \lambda^{1-m-\alpha} ((\mu D)^{m+\alpha} + \mu D \ell^{1-m-\alpha}) \right] \end{aligned}$$

Choose now

$$m = \left\lceil \frac{1+\omega}{\omega} \right\rceil + 1$$

and observe that

$$\frac{m}{m-1} \leq 1 + \omega.$$

Then the last inequality in (4.3) becomes

$$\lambda^{1-m} \leq \min\{\ell^m, (\mu D)^{-m}\}$$

and

$$\|\psi' \mathring{R}_1^8\|_0 \leq C_{v,s} |\psi'| \sqrt{\delta^*} \mu D \lambda^{\alpha-1}.$$

To estimate $\|\psi' \mathring{R}_1^8\|_1$ one can proceed exactly in the same way getting

$$\|\psi' \mathring{R}_1^8\|_1 \leq |\psi''| C_{v,s} \sqrt{\delta^*} \mu D \lambda^{\alpha-1} + |\psi'| C_{v,s} \sqrt{\delta^*} \mu D \lambda^\alpha. \quad (5.32)$$

Thus we conclude

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathring{R}_1 - (1 - \psi^2) \mathring{R}\|_0 &\leq C_{v,s} [\psi D \ell + \psi \sqrt{\delta^*} \mu D \lambda^{2\alpha-1} + \psi \sqrt{\delta^*} \mu^{-1} \lambda^\alpha + |\psi'| \sqrt{\delta^*} \mu D \lambda^{\alpha-1}] \\ \|\mathring{R}_1 - (1 - \psi^2) \mathring{R}\|_1 &\leq C_{v,s} [\psi D + \psi \sqrt{\delta^*} \lambda D \ell + \psi \sqrt{\delta^*} \mu^{-1} \lambda^{\alpha+1} + \psi \sqrt{\delta^*} \mu D \lambda^{2\alpha} \\ &+ |\psi'| D \ell + |\psi'| \sqrt{\delta^*} \mu D \lambda^\alpha + |\psi'| \sqrt{\delta^*} \mu^{-1} \lambda^\alpha \\ &+ |\psi''| \sqrt{\delta^*} \mu D \lambda^{\alpha-1}] \\ &\leq C_{v,s} [\psi \sqrt{\delta^*} \mu D \lambda^{2\alpha} + \psi \sqrt{\delta^*} \lambda D \ell + \psi \sqrt{\delta^*} \mu^{-1} \lambda^{\alpha+1} \\ &+ |\psi'| D \ell + |\psi'| \sqrt{\delta^*} \mu D \lambda^\alpha + |\psi'| \sqrt{\delta^*} \mu^{-1} \lambda^\alpha \\ &+ |\psi''| \sqrt{\delta^*} \mu D \lambda^{\alpha-1}], \end{aligned}$$

where in the last inequality we have used

$$\sqrt{\delta^*} \mu D \stackrel{(4.3)}{\geq} D (\delta^*)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \geq D.$$

□

5.5. Proof of Proposition 2.2. After constructing $(v_1, p_1, \mathring{R}_1)$ as in Section 4, we fix the perturbation parameters μ, λ, ℓ and the Hölder exponent α in the estimates of Sections 5.2, 5.3 and 5.4.

More precisely, in Propositions 5.3 and 5.4 choose –as in Section 9 of [DLS12H]–

$$\alpha = \frac{\omega}{2 + \omega} = \frac{\varepsilon}{4(\varepsilon + 1)}.$$

and assume that

$$\ell = \frac{1}{L_v} \bar{\delta},$$

where $L_v > \eta^{-1}$ is a sufficiently large constant depending only on $\|v\|_{C^0}$ and e in such a way that (4.1) is satisfied. Then, impose

$$\mu^2 D = \lambda, \quad (5.33)$$

where actually, as observed in [DLS12H], to be sure to satisfy (4.2) one can carry on analogous computations imposing $\frac{\lambda}{2} \leq \mu^2 D \leq \lambda$. In particular,

$$\mu^{-1} \lambda^\alpha = \mu D \lambda^{\alpha-1}. \quad (5.34)$$

Finally, choose λ of the form

$$\lambda = \Lambda_v \left(\frac{D \hat{\delta}}{\bar{\delta}^{2+\nu}} \right)^{1+\varepsilon} = \Lambda_v \left(\frac{D \hat{\delta}}{\bar{\delta}^{2+\nu}} \right)^{\frac{1+\omega}{1-\omega}}, \quad (5.35)$$

where $\Lambda_v \geq 1$ depends only on $\|v\|_{C^0}$ and

$$\nu = \frac{4}{9}. \quad (5.36)$$

Observe that in [DLS12H] the authors set $\nu = 0$.

Let us check that the choice of the parameters is consistent with (4.3). If $\Lambda_v \geq L_v^{1+\omega}$,

$$\lambda^{1+\omega} = \frac{\Lambda_v}{L_v^{1+\omega}} \left(\frac{D \hat{\delta}}{\bar{\delta}^{2+\nu}} \right)^{\frac{1+\omega}{1-\omega}} \left(\frac{\bar{\delta}}{D} \right)^{1+\omega} \geq \left(D^\omega \frac{\hat{\delta} \bar{\delta}^{\frac{2}{2+\varepsilon}}}{\bar{\delta}^{2+\nu}} \right)^{\frac{1+\omega}{1-\omega}} \geq 1$$

and since $\mu D = \lambda^{\frac{1}{2}} D^{\frac{1}{2}}$

$$\lambda^{-1} (\mu D)^{(1+\omega)} = \lambda^{\frac{\omega-1}{2}} D^{\frac{1+\omega}{2}} = \Lambda_v^{\frac{\omega-1}{2}} D^{\frac{1+\omega}{2}} \left(\frac{D \hat{\delta}}{\bar{\delta}^{2+\nu}} \right)^{-\frac{1+\omega}{2}} = \Lambda_v^{\frac{\omega-1}{2}} \left(\frac{\bar{\delta}^{2+\nu}}{\hat{\delta}} \right)^{\frac{1+\omega}{2}} \leq 1$$

Moreover, by our choice of α

$$\mu D \lambda^{\alpha-1} \leq 1. \quad (5.37)$$

This follows from $\mu D \leq \lambda^{\frac{1}{\omega+1}}$ and the fact that $\frac{1}{\omega+1} \leq 1 - \alpha$. Finally,

$$\mu = \sqrt{\frac{\lambda}{D}} = \Lambda_v^{\frac{1}{2}} D^{\frac{\varepsilon}{2}} \left(\frac{\hat{\delta}}{\bar{\delta}^{2+\nu}} \right)^{\frac{1+\varepsilon}{2}} \geq \bar{\delta}^{-\frac{2}{3} - \frac{\varepsilon}{2}} \geq \delta^{*-1}.$$

Being now α fixed, the constants $C_{e,s}$ and $C_{v,s}$ which in general depend on α will be from now onwards denoted by C_e and C_v .

Preliminary estimates

Before inserting the above parameters in the estimates of Sections 5.2, 5.3 and 5.4, it is convenient to estimate separately some of the terms which will often appear in the calculations.

By our choice of α

$$\alpha - \frac{1}{2} = -\frac{\varepsilon + 2}{4(\varepsilon + 1)}, \quad 2\alpha - \frac{1}{2} = -\frac{1}{2(1 + \varepsilon)}, \quad \alpha + \frac{1}{2} = \frac{3\varepsilon + 2}{4(\varepsilon + 1)}, \quad 2\alpha + \frac{1}{2} = \frac{2\varepsilon + 1}{2(1 + \varepsilon)}. \quad (5.38)$$

Moreover, by definitions (2.2) and (2.3)

$$\sqrt{\frac{\delta^*}{\hat{\delta}}} \leq \sqrt{\frac{\delta''}{\hat{\delta}}} = \hat{\delta}^{-\frac{5}{18}} \leq \bar{\delta}^{-\frac{5}{27}}. \quad (5.39)$$

Then we have the following estimates:

$$\begin{aligned} \sqrt{\delta^*} \mu D \lambda^{\alpha-1} &= \sqrt{\delta^*} D^{\frac{1}{2}} \lambda^{\alpha-\frac{1}{2}} = \sqrt{\delta^*} D^{\frac{1}{2}} \Lambda_v^{-\frac{\varepsilon+2}{4(\varepsilon+1)}} \left(\frac{D \hat{\delta}}{\bar{\delta}^{2+\nu}} \right)^{-\frac{\varepsilon}{4} - \frac{1}{2}} \\ &\leq \Lambda_v^{-\frac{\varepsilon+2}{4(\varepsilon+1)}} \sqrt{\frac{\delta^*}{\hat{\delta}}} \bar{\delta}^{\frac{11}{9} + \frac{11}{18}\varepsilon} \hat{\delta}^{-\frac{\varepsilon}{4}} \leq \Lambda_v^{-\frac{\varepsilon+2}{4(\varepsilon+1)}} \sqrt{\frac{\delta^*}{\hat{\delta}}} \bar{\delta}^{\frac{11}{9} + \frac{4}{9}\varepsilon} \stackrel{(5.39)}{\leq} \Lambda_v^{-\frac{\varepsilon+2}{4(\varepsilon+1)}} \bar{\delta}^{\frac{28}{27} + \frac{4}{9}\varepsilon} \end{aligned} \quad (5.40)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \sqrt{\delta^*} \mu D \lambda^{2\alpha-1} &= \sqrt{\delta^*} D^{\frac{1}{2}} \lambda^{2\alpha-\frac{1}{2}} = \sqrt{\delta^*} D^{\frac{1}{2}} \Lambda_v^{-\frac{1}{2(1+\varepsilon)}} \left(\frac{D \hat{\delta}}{\bar{\delta}^{2+\nu}} \right)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \\ &= \Lambda_v^{-\frac{1}{2(1+\varepsilon)}} \sqrt{\frac{\delta^*}{\hat{\delta}}} \bar{\delta}^{\frac{11}{9}} \stackrel{(5.39)}{\leq} \Lambda_v^{-\frac{1}{2(1+\varepsilon)}} \bar{\delta}^{\frac{28}{27}} \end{aligned} \quad (5.41)$$

$$\begin{aligned}
\sqrt{\delta^*} \mu D \lambda^{2\alpha} &= \sqrt{\delta^*} D^{\frac{1}{2}} \lambda^{2\alpha + \frac{1}{2}} = \sqrt{\delta^*} D^{\frac{1}{2}} \Lambda_v^{\frac{2\varepsilon+1}{2(\varepsilon+1)}} \left(\frac{D \hat{\delta}}{\bar{\delta}^{2+\nu}} \right)^{\varepsilon + \frac{1}{2}} \\
&\leq \Lambda_v^{\frac{2\varepsilon+1}{2(\varepsilon+1)}} \sqrt{\frac{\delta^*}{\hat{\delta}}} \hat{\delta}^{\frac{3}{2} + \varepsilon} \bar{\delta}^{\frac{4}{9} - \frac{4}{9}\varepsilon} \left(\frac{D}{\bar{\delta}^2} \right)^{1+\varepsilon} \stackrel{(5.39)}{\leq} \Lambda_v^{\frac{2\varepsilon+1}{2(\varepsilon+1)}} \hat{\delta}^{\frac{3}{2} + \varepsilon} \bar{\delta}^{\frac{7}{27} - \frac{4}{9}\varepsilon} \left(\frac{D}{\bar{\delta}^2} \right)^{1+\varepsilon}
\end{aligned} \tag{5.42}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
\sqrt{\delta^*} \mu D \lambda^\alpha &= \sqrt{\delta^*} D^{\frac{1}{2}} \lambda^{\alpha + \frac{1}{2}} = \sqrt{\delta^*} D^{\frac{1}{2}} \Lambda_v^{\frac{3\varepsilon+2}{4(\varepsilon+1)}} \left(\frac{D \hat{\delta}}{\bar{\delta}^{2+\nu}} \right)^{\frac{3}{4}\varepsilon + \frac{1}{2}} \\
&\leq \Lambda_v^{\frac{3\varepsilon+2}{4(\varepsilon+1)}} \sqrt{\frac{\delta^*}{\hat{\delta}}} \hat{\delta}^{\frac{3}{2} + \frac{3}{4}\varepsilon} \bar{\delta}^{\frac{4}{9} + \frac{\varepsilon}{6}} \left(\frac{D}{\bar{\delta}^2} \right)^{1+\varepsilon} \leq \Lambda_v^{\frac{3\varepsilon+2}{4(\varepsilon+1)}} \hat{\delta}^{\frac{3}{2} + \frac{3}{4}\varepsilon} \bar{\delta}^{\frac{7}{27} + \frac{\varepsilon}{6}} \left(\frac{D}{\bar{\delta}^2} \right)^{1+\varepsilon}
\end{aligned} \tag{5.43}$$

$$\sqrt{\delta^*} \lambda = \sqrt{\frac{\delta^*}{\hat{\delta}}} \hat{\delta}^{\frac{3}{2} + \varepsilon} \left(\frac{D}{\bar{\delta}^2} \right)^{1+\varepsilon} \bar{\delta}^{-\frac{4}{9} - \frac{4}{9}\varepsilon} \leq \hat{\delta}^{\frac{3}{2} + \varepsilon} \left(\frac{D}{\bar{\delta}^2} \right)^{1+\varepsilon} \bar{\delta}^{-\frac{17}{27} - \frac{4}{9}\varepsilon} \tag{5.44}$$

Proof of (2.9)

By Proposition 5.3

$$\begin{aligned}
\left| e - \int_{\mathbb{T}^3} |v_1|^2 - \left[\psi^2 \bar{\delta} e + (1 - \psi^2) \left(e - \int_{\mathbb{T}^3} |v|^2 \right) \right] \right| &\leq \psi^2 C_v D l + \psi C_v \sqrt{\delta^*} \mu D \lambda^{\alpha-1} \\
&\stackrel{(5.40)}{\leq} \psi^2 \frac{C_v}{L_v} \bar{\delta} + \psi \frac{C_v}{\Lambda_v^{\frac{1}{2(1+\varepsilon)}}} \bar{\delta}^{\frac{28}{27} + \frac{4}{9}\varepsilon}
\end{aligned}$$

Hence, provided L_v and consequently Λ_v are chosen sufficiently big depending on $\|v\|_{C_0}$, we get (2.9).

Proof of (2.10) and (2.11).

We use the estimates obtained in Proposition 5.2.

Taking (5.23) for $r = 0$ and (5.25) for $r = \alpha$ we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\psi w_1\|_0 &\leq \psi C_e (\sqrt{\delta^*} + \sqrt{\delta^*} \mu D \lambda^{\alpha-1}) \\
&\stackrel{(5.37)}{\leq} \psi M \sqrt{\delta^*},
\end{aligned} \tag{5.45}$$

provided the constant $M = M(e)$ is large enough.

Consider now (5.23) with $r = 1$, (5.24) with $r = 0$, (5.25) with $r = \alpha + 1$ and (5.26) with $r = \alpha$. Then

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\psi w_1\|_1 &\leq \psi C_e \sqrt{\delta^*} \lambda + |\psi'| C_v \sqrt{\delta^*} + \psi C_v \sqrt{\delta^*} \mu D \lambda^\alpha + |\psi'| C_v \sqrt{\delta^*} \mu D \lambda^{\alpha-1} \\
&\stackrel{(5.37)}{\leq} \psi C_v \sqrt{\delta^*} \lambda + |\psi'| C_v \sqrt{\delta^*} \\
&\stackrel{(5.44)}{\leq} \psi \Lambda_v \hat{\delta}^{\frac{3}{2} + \varepsilon} \left(\frac{D}{\bar{\delta}^2} \right)^{1+\varepsilon} \bar{\delta}^{-\frac{17}{27} - \frac{4}{9}\varepsilon} + |\psi'| C_v \sqrt{\delta^*}.
\end{aligned} \tag{5.46}$$

In particular, since by (5.33) and (4.3) it is fairly easy to check that $D \leq \sqrt{\delta^*} \lambda$,

$$\|v_1\|_1 \leq 2 \Lambda_v \hat{\delta}^{\frac{3}{2} + \varepsilon} \left(\frac{D}{\bar{\delta}^2} \right)^{1+\varepsilon} \bar{\delta}^{-\frac{17}{27} - \frac{4}{9}\varepsilon} + |\psi'| C_v \sqrt{\delta^*}.$$

Proof of (2.12) Using (4.14) and (5.45) we get

$$\|p_1 - p\|_0 \leq \psi^2 \frac{M^2}{4} \delta^* + \psi \frac{3}{4} M \bar{\delta} \sqrt{\delta^*} \leq \psi M^2 \delta^*. \tag{5.47}$$

Proof of (2.13), (2.14), (2.15) and (2.16).

From (5.31), define

$$\begin{aligned}
\hat{R}_{1,1} &:= \psi \hat{R}_1^1 + \hat{R}_1^2 + \psi \hat{R}_1^3 + \hat{R}_1^4 + \hat{R}_1^5 + \hat{R}_1^6 + \hat{R}_1^7, \\
\hat{R}_{1,2} &:= \hat{R}_1^8.
\end{aligned}$$

By (5.29) and (5.34)

$$\|\psi \mathring{R}_{1,1}\|_0 \leq \psi C_v D \ell + \psi C_v \sqrt{\delta^*} \mu D \lambda^{2\alpha-1} \stackrel{(5.41)}{\leq} \psi \frac{C_v}{L_v} \bar{\delta} + \psi \frac{C_v}{\Lambda_v^{\frac{1}{2(1+\varepsilon)}}} \bar{\delta}^{\frac{28}{27}} \leq \psi \frac{\eta}{2} \bar{\delta},$$

provided L_v and then Λ_v are chosen large enough.

Moreover,

$$\|\psi' \mathring{R}_{1,2}\|_0 \leq |\psi'| C_v \sqrt{\delta^*} \mu D \lambda^{\alpha-1} \stackrel{(5.40)}{\leq} |\psi'| \frac{C_v}{\Lambda_v^{\frac{\varepsilon+2}{4(\varepsilon+1)}}} \bar{\delta}^{\frac{28}{27} + \frac{4}{9}\varepsilon}.$$

By (5.30), (5.34), (5.42), (5.41) and (5.44)

$$\begin{aligned} \|\psi \mathring{R}_{1,1}\|_1 &\leq \psi C_v [\sqrt{\delta^*} \mu D \lambda^{2\alpha} + \sqrt{\delta^*} \lambda D \ell] + |\psi'| C_v \sqrt{\delta^*} \mu D \lambda^{2\alpha-1} \\ &\leq \psi C_v \left[\Lambda_v^{\frac{2\varepsilon+1}{2(\varepsilon+1)}} \delta^{\frac{3}{2} + \varepsilon} \bar{\delta}^{\frac{7}{27} - \frac{4}{9}\varepsilon} \left(\frac{D}{\delta^2}\right)^{1+\varepsilon} + \frac{\Lambda_v}{L_v} \delta^{\frac{3}{2} + \varepsilon} \bar{\delta}^{\frac{10}{27} - \frac{4}{9}\varepsilon} \left(\frac{D}{\delta^2}\right)^{1+\varepsilon} \right] + |\psi'| \frac{C_v}{\Lambda_v^{\frac{1}{2(1+\varepsilon)}}} \bar{\delta}^{\frac{28}{27}} \end{aligned}$$

and by (5.32), (5.40) and (5.43)

$$\begin{aligned} \|\psi' \mathring{R}_{1,2}\|_1 &\leq |\psi'| C_v \sqrt{\delta^*} \mu D \lambda^\alpha + |\psi''| C_v \sqrt{\delta^*} \mu D \lambda^{\alpha-1} \\ &\leq |\psi'| C_v \Lambda_v^{\frac{3\varepsilon+2}{4(\varepsilon+1)}} \delta^{\frac{3}{2} + \frac{3}{4}\varepsilon} \bar{\delta}^{\frac{7}{27} + \frac{\varepsilon}{6}} \left(\frac{D}{\delta^2}\right)^{1+\varepsilon} + |\psi''| C_v \Lambda_v^{-\frac{\varepsilon+2}{4(\varepsilon+1)}} \bar{\delta}^{\frac{28}{27} + \frac{4}{9}\varepsilon}. \end{aligned}$$

We thus end up with (2.15) and (2.16) again choosing suitable constants L_v and Λ_v and A_1 sufficiently big.

Proof of Corollary 2.3. Let $\psi \in C^\infty([a_1, a_2]; [0, 1])$ be a function satisfying (2.18). In the following we will extensively use the relations

$$\bar{\delta} \leq \delta^{\frac{3}{2}} = \delta'^{\frac{9}{4}}. \quad (5.48)$$

To prove (2.20) recall (2.13) and observe that

$$\|\psi' \mathring{R}_{1,2}\|_0 \stackrel{(2.14)}{\leq} |\psi'| \frac{\eta}{2C} \bar{\delta}^{\frac{28}{27} + \frac{4}{9}\varepsilon} \leq \frac{\eta}{2} \bar{\delta} [(\delta')^{-\frac{3\varepsilon}{4}} \bar{\delta}^{\frac{1}{27} + \frac{4}{9}\varepsilon}] \stackrel{(5.48)}{\leq} \frac{\eta}{2} \bar{\delta}.$$

As for (2.21), let us first consider (2.15). On one hand, since $\varepsilon < \frac{7}{12}$,

$$\psi A_1 \delta^{\frac{3}{2} + \varepsilon} \left(\frac{D}{\delta^2}\right)^{1+\varepsilon} \bar{\delta}^{\frac{7}{27} - \frac{4}{9}\varepsilon} \leq \psi A_1 \delta^{\frac{3}{2}} \left(\frac{D}{\delta^2}\right)^{1+\varepsilon}.$$

On the other hand,

$$|\psi'| \frac{1}{C} \bar{\delta}^{\frac{28}{27}} \stackrel{(2.18)}{\leq} \chi_{\{\psi>0\}} \delta^{\frac{19}{27}} \leq \chi_{\{\psi>0\}}, \quad \delta^{\frac{3}{2}} \left(\frac{D}{\delta^2}\right)^{1+\varepsilon} \geq 1,$$

so that

$$\|\psi \mathring{R}_{1,1}\|_1 \leq \chi_{\{\psi>0\}} A_1 \delta^{\frac{3}{2}} \left(\frac{D}{\delta^2}\right)^{1+\varepsilon}.$$

To show that also $\|\psi' \mathring{R}_{1,2}\|_1 \leq \chi_{\{\psi>0\}} A_1 \delta^{\frac{3}{2}} \left(\frac{D}{\delta^2}\right)^{1+\varepsilon}$, it is sufficient to notice that

$$|\psi'| \frac{1}{C} \delta^{\frac{3}{4}\varepsilon} \leq 1, \quad |\psi''| \frac{1}{C^2} \bar{\delta}^{\frac{28}{27} + \frac{4}{9}\varepsilon} \leq 1, \quad \delta^{\frac{3}{2}} \left(\frac{D}{\delta^2}\right)^{1+\varepsilon} \geq 1.$$

Finally, to prove (2.22), we choose $\nu = 0$ in (5.35) as in [DLS12H], i.e. we set

$$\lambda = \Lambda_v \left(\frac{D \hat{\delta}}{\delta^2}\right)^{1+\varepsilon} \quad (5.49)$$

as in [DLS12H]. Since the λ defined in (5.49) is smaller than the λ defined in (5.35), then the C^1 estimates for the Reynolds stress proved before hold as well. In order to prove the energy estimate and the C^0 estimates, notice that if $\delta^* = \hat{\delta}$

$$\begin{aligned} \sqrt{\hat{\delta}} \mu D \lambda^{\alpha-1} &= \sqrt{\hat{\delta}} D^{\frac{1}{2}} \Lambda_v^{-\frac{\varepsilon+2}{4(\varepsilon+1)}} \left(\frac{D \hat{\delta}}{\delta^2}\right)^{-\frac{\varepsilon}{4} - \frac{1}{2}} \leq \Lambda_v^{-\frac{\varepsilon+2}{4(\varepsilon+1)}} \bar{\delta} \hat{\delta}^{\frac{\varepsilon}{2}}, \\ \sqrt{\hat{\delta}} \mu D \lambda^{2\alpha-1} &= \sqrt{\hat{\delta}} D^{\frac{1}{2}} \Lambda_v^{-\frac{1}{2(\varepsilon+1)}} \left(\frac{D \hat{\delta}}{\delta^2}\right)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \leq \Lambda_v^{-\frac{1}{2(\varepsilon+1)}} \bar{\delta} \end{aligned}$$

and proceed as in the proof of Proposition 2.2. As for the improvement (2.22) in the C^1 norm of v_1 ,

$$\|\psi w_1\|_1 \leq \psi C_v \sqrt{\hat{\delta}} \stackrel{(5.49)}{\leq} \psi C_v \Lambda_v \hat{\delta}^{\frac{3}{2}+\varepsilon} \left(\frac{D}{\hat{\delta}^2}\right)^{1+\varepsilon}.$$

□

6. ADMISSIBLE INITIAL DATA

Proposition 6.1. *Let $e \in C^\infty([0, 1])$, $e > 0$. Then, for all $\theta < \frac{1}{10}$, $0 < \beta \leq \frac{1}{2}$ there exist $v_0 \in C^\theta(\mathbb{T}^3; \mathbb{R}^3)$ and $(v, p, \mathring{R}) \in C^0(\mathbb{T}^3 \times [0, 1]; \mathbb{R}^3 \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathcal{S}_0^{3 \times 3}) \cap C^1(\mathbb{T}^3 \times (0, 1]; \mathbb{R}^3 \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathcal{S}_0^{3 \times 3})$ which solve the Euler-Reynolds system (2.1) on $\mathbb{T}^3 \times (0, 1)$ with*

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\mathbb{T}^3} |v_0|^2 &= e(0), \quad \mathring{R}(0) \equiv 0 \\ v(0) &= v_0, \quad v(t) \in C^\theta(\mathbb{T}^3) \quad \forall t \in [0, 1]. \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, there exist

$$0 < \varepsilon = \varepsilon(\theta) < 1 \text{ with } \lim_{\theta \rightarrow \frac{1}{10}} \varepsilon(\theta) = 0$$

and sequences

$$\begin{aligned} \delta_n &= a^{-b^n}, \quad a \geq \frac{3}{2}, \quad b = \frac{3}{2}, \quad \text{with } a = a(\varepsilon), \\ t_0 &:= 1, \quad t_n \in (0, 1) \text{ s.t. } t_n < t_{n-1} \text{ and } t_{n-1} - t_n = \frac{2}{C} \delta_{n-1}^{\frac{3\varepsilon}{4}}, \quad \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} t_{n-1} - t_n = 1 \\ \varphi_n &\in C^\infty([0, 1]; [0, 1]) \text{ s.t. } \varphi_n(t) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } t \in [0, t_n] \\ 0 & \text{if } t \in [t_{n-1}, 1] \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

such that

$$\left| \left(e - \int |v|^2 \right) - [\varphi_n^2 \delta_n + (1 - \varphi_n^2) \delta_{n-1}] e \right| \chi_{[t_n, t_{n-1}]} \leq \frac{\beta}{2} [\varphi_n^2 \delta_n + (1 - \varphi_n^2) \delta_{n-1}] e, \quad (6.1)$$

$$\|\mathring{R} - (1 - \varphi_n^2) \mathring{R}'_n\|_0 \chi_{[t_n, t_{n-1}]} \leq \chi_{\{\varphi_n > 0\}} \eta \delta_n, \quad \|\mathring{R}'_n\|_0 \leq \eta \delta_{n-1}, \quad (6.2)$$

for some $\mathring{R}'_n \in C^1(\mathbb{T}^3 \times [0, 1]; \mathcal{S}_0^{3 \times 3})$, with $\delta_0 = 1$ and η depending on e as in Proposition 2.2.

Definition 6.2. A triple (v, p, \mathring{R}) as in Proposition 6.1 will be called an *admissible C^θ -subsolution* with admissible initial datum v_0 for the energy e .

Remark 6.3. In the proofs of Proposition 6.1 and Theorem 1.1 we will repeatedly use the following fact. Let $\psi, \varphi \in C^1([0, 1]; [0, 1])$ such that

$$\text{supp } \psi \subset \{\varphi = 1\}. \quad (6.3)$$

Then,

$$(\psi + \psi')(1 - \varphi) = 0, \quad (1 - \psi^2)(1 - \varphi^2) = (1 - \varphi^2), \quad \psi\varphi = \psi, \quad (6.4)$$

Proof of Proposition 6.1. Step 0. W.l.o.g., we assume that $\exists h > 0$ such that e is positive and smooth on the larger time interval $[-h, 1 + h]$. Define then $(v_0, p_0, \mathring{R}_0)$ to be identically 0 on $\mathbb{T}^3 \times [-h, 1 + h]$ and observe that it satisfies the assumptions of Proposition 2.2 on $[a_1, a_2] = [-h, 1 + h]$ with $\varphi \equiv 1$ and $\hat{\delta} = 1$. Fix $\varepsilon > 0$ arbitrarily small and set $\delta_0 := \hat{\delta} = 1$, $D_0 := D \equiv 1$, $\ell_0 = 0$ and $\varphi_0 := \varphi \equiv 1$.

Starting from $(v_0, p_0, \mathring{R}_0)$ we construct iteratively –using Proposition 2.2– a sequence of solutions $(v_n, p_n, \mathring{R}_n)$ of the Euler-Reynolds system which will converge to an admissible C^θ subsolution $(\bar{v}, \bar{p}, \bar{\mathring{R}})$.

To this aim, we first set the following parameters:

$$\begin{aligned}
\delta_n &= a^{-b^n}, \quad a \geq \frac{3}{2}, b = \frac{3}{2}, \text{ with } a = a(\varepsilon) \text{ to be fixed later} \\
\bar{C} &= 4 \sum_n \delta_{n-1}^{\frac{3}{4}\varepsilon} = 4 \sum_n a^{-\frac{3\varepsilon}{4}b^{n-1}} \\
\tilde{\ell}_n &= \frac{2}{\bar{C}} \delta_{n-1}^{\frac{3\varepsilon}{4}}, \\
t_0 &:= 1, \quad t_n \in (0, 1) \text{ s.t. } t_n < t_{n-1} \text{ and } t_{n-1} - t_n = \frac{4}{\bar{C}} \delta_{n-1}^{\frac{3\varepsilon}{4}} = 2\tilde{\ell}_n, \\
\bar{\ell}_n &> 0 \text{ s.t. } \sum_n \bar{\ell}_n < h
\end{aligned} \tag{6.5}$$

and a countable family of cut-off functions

$$\varphi_n \in C^\infty([-h, 1+h]; [0, 1]) \text{ s.t. } \varphi_n(t) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } t \in [-h, t_n] \\ 0 & \text{if } t \in [t_{n-1} - \tilde{\ell}_n, 1+h] = [t_n + \tilde{\ell}_n, 1+h] \end{cases} \tag{6.6}$$

$$\text{and } |\varphi'_n| \leq \frac{4}{t_{n-1} - t_n} = \bar{C} \delta_{n-1}^{-\frac{3\varepsilon}{4}}, \quad |\varphi''_n| \leq \frac{4 \max |\varphi'_n|}{t_{n-1} - t_n} \leq \bar{C}^2 \delta_{n-1}^{-\frac{3\varepsilon}{2}}. \tag{6.7}$$

Notice that, if a is sufficiently big, $\delta_n \leq \min\{\frac{1}{2}\delta_{n-1}, \delta_{n-1}^{\frac{3}{2}}\}$ and, by the choice of \bar{C} , $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} t_{n-1} - t_n = 1$.

Moreover, the functions $\psi = \varphi_n$, $\varphi = \varphi_{n-1}$ satisfy (6.3) for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. In particular,

$$\prod_{i=k}^{\bar{k}} (1 - \varphi_i^2) = 1 - \varphi_k^2, \quad \prod_{i=k}^{\bar{k}} \varphi_i = \varphi_{\bar{k}}, \quad (1 - \varphi_i^2)\varphi_j = 0 \text{ if } i < j. \tag{6.8}$$

Step 1. Iterative perturbation step

Let us assume that, after n steps of the iterative procedure there exist $\{\ell_i\}_{i=1}^n$, $0 < \ell_i < \min\{\bar{\ell}_i, \tilde{\ell}_i\}$ and $\{(v_i, p_i, \mathring{R}_i)\}_{i=1}^n$ solutions of (2.1) on $[-h + \sum_{i=1}^n \ell_i, 1+h]$ satisfying

$$v_n = v_{n-1} + \varphi_n w_n \tag{6.9}$$

$$p_n = p_{n-1} + \varphi_n p_n \tag{6.10}$$

$$\mathring{R}_n = \varphi_n \mathring{R}_{n,1} + \varphi'_n \mathring{R}_{n,2} + (1 - \varphi_n^2) \mathring{R}_{n-1} \tag{6.11}$$

and the following estimates

$$\left| e - \int |v_n|^2 - \left[\varphi_n^2 \delta_n + (1 - \varphi_n^2) \left(e - \int |v_{n-1}|^2 \right) \right] \right| \leq \varphi_n \frac{\beta}{4} \delta_n e \tag{6.12}$$

$$\|v_n - v_{n-1}\|_0 \leq \varphi_n M \sqrt{\delta_{n-1}} \tag{6.13}$$

$$\|\mathring{R}_n - (1 - \varphi_n^2) \mathring{R}_{n-1}\|_0 \leq \chi_{\{\varphi_n > 0\}} \eta \delta_n \tag{6.14}$$

$$\|p_n - p_{n-1}\|_0 \leq \varphi_n M^2 \delta_{n-1} \tag{6.15}$$

$$D_n \leq A_{n-1} \delta_{n-1}^{\frac{3}{2}} \left(\frac{D_{n-1}}{\delta_n^2} \right)^{1+\varepsilon}, \tag{6.16}$$

where

$$D_i := \max\{1, \|v_i\|_{C^1}, \|\mathring{R}_i\|_{C^1}\}$$

and $A_i = A_i(e, \varepsilon, \|v_i\|_{C^0})$.

In particular, on $[-h + \sum_{i=1}^n \ell_i, t_n] \subset \{\varphi_n = 1\}$

$$\begin{aligned}
\left| e - \int |v_n|^2 - \delta_n e \right| &\leq \frac{\beta}{4} \delta_n e \\
\|\mathring{R}_n\|_0 &\leq \eta \delta_n.
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore $(v_n, p_n, \mathring{R}_n)$ satisfies the assumptions of Proposition 2.2 on $[a_1, a_2] = [-h + \sum_{i=1}^n \ell_i, t_n]$ with $\varphi \equiv 1$ (or equivalently $\delta^* = \hat{\delta}$) and $\hat{\delta} = \delta_n$. Then, since

$$\text{supp } \varphi_{n+1} \subset [-h + \sum_{i=1}^n \ell_i, t_n - \tilde{\ell}_{n+1}], \quad (6.17)$$

we can apply Corollary 2.3 with $\psi = \varphi_{n+1}$, $\ell = \ell_{n+1} < \min\{\bar{\ell}_{n+1}, \tilde{\ell}_{n+1}\}$, $\bar{\delta} = \delta_{n+1}$.

We thus get (6.9)-(6.16) on the time interval $[-h + \sum_{i=1}^{n+1} \ell_i, t_n - \ell_{n+1}]$, with n replaced by $n+1$.

Now observe that, since $\varphi_{n+1} = 0$ on $[t_n - \ell_{n+1}, 1+h]$, we can extend trivially v_{n+1} to be equal to v_n , p_{n+1} to p_n and \mathring{R}_{n+1} to \mathring{R}_n on $[t_n - \ell_{n+1}, 1+h]$ and moreover also (6.9)-(6.16) extend to the larger time interval $[-h + \sum_{i=1}^{n+1} \ell_i, 1+h]$.

Step 2: Convergence to a subsolution

By (6.5), the functions $(v_n, p_n, \mathring{R}_n)$ are well defined on $\mathbb{T}^3 \times [0, 1]$.

From (6.13), (6.14) and (6.15) we immediately get that

$$\exists (v, p, \mathring{R}) \in C^0(\mathbb{T}^3 \times [0, 1]; \mathbb{R}^3 \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathcal{S}_0^{3 \times 3}) \text{ s.t. } \lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \|v_n - v\|_{C^0} + \|p_n - p\|_{C^0} + \|\mathring{R}_n - \mathring{R}\|_{C^0} = 0.$$

In particular, there exists a constant $A = A(\varepsilon, e, \bar{C})$ such that

$$A_n \leq A, \quad \forall n \in \mathbb{N},$$

and from now onwards we will substitute it to A_n into (6.16).

Moreover, since $\|\mathring{R}_n(0)\|_0 \leq \eta \delta_n$ and $|e(0) - \int |v_n|^2(0)| \leq \left(1 + \frac{\beta}{4}\right) \delta_n e(0)$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$\mathring{R}(0) \equiv 0, \quad \int_{\mathbb{T}^3} |v|^2(0) = e(0).$$

From the structure equations (6.9), (6.10) and (6.11) and (6.17) it is also fairly easy to see that, $\forall n \in \mathbb{N}$

$$v\chi_{[t_n, t_{n-1}]} = v_n\chi_{[t_n, t_{n-1}]} = v_0 + \varphi_n w_n + \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} w_i \quad (6.18)$$

$$p\chi_{[t_n, t_{n-1}]} = p_n\chi_{[t_n, t_{n-1}]} = p_0 + \varphi_n p_{n0} + \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} p_{i0} \quad (6.19)$$

$$\mathring{R}\chi_{[t_n, t_{n-1}]} = \mathring{R}_n\chi_{[t_n, t_{n-1}]} = \varphi_n \mathring{R}_{n,1} + \varphi'_n \mathring{R}_{n,2} + (1 - \varphi_n^2) \mathring{R}_{n-1,1} \quad (6.20)$$

In particular (v, p, \mathring{R}) satisfies (2.1) on $\mathbb{T}^3 \times (0, 1)$.

Moreover, using (6.18) and the structural assumptions (6.8) on the cut-off functions φ_n we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \left(e - \int |v|^2\right)\chi_{[t_n, t_{n-1}]} &= \varphi_n^2 \delta_n e + (1 - \varphi_n^2) \left(e - \int |v_{n-1}|^2\right) + \varphi_n \tilde{e}_n \\ &= \varphi_n^2 \delta_n e + (1 - \varphi_n^2) \varphi_{n-1}^2 \delta_{n-1} e + (1 - \varphi_n^2) (1 - \varphi_{n-1}^2) \delta_{n-2} e \\ &\quad + (1 - \varphi_n^2) \varphi_{n-1} \tilde{e}_{n-1} + \varphi_n \tilde{e}_n \\ &= \varphi_n^2 \delta_n e + (1 - \varphi_n^2) \delta_{n-1} e + (1 - \varphi_n^2) \tilde{e}_{n-1} + \varphi_n \tilde{e}_n \end{aligned} \quad (6.21)$$

where

$$\varphi_i \tilde{e}_i := e - \int |v_i|^2 - \left[\varphi_i^2 \delta_i + (1 - \varphi_i^2) \left(e - \int |v_{i-1}|^2\right)\right], \quad |\tilde{e}_i| \leq \frac{\beta}{4} \delta_i e.$$

By Lemma 3.7 we have then (6.1).

Step 3: Convergence in the Hölder norm.

To show that the sequence $\{v_n(t)\}$ converges to $v(t)$ in $C^\theta(\mathbb{T}^3; \mathbb{R}^3)$ with exponent $\theta < \frac{1}{10}$ we use the same argument of [DLS12H], thanks to the fact that the rate of decay (resp. growth) of the C^0 (resp. C^1) norms between two successive approximations are double exponentials with suitable exponents. More precisely, our claim is that $\forall n \in \mathbb{N}$

$$D_n \leq a^{cb^n} \quad (6.22)$$

with $c = \frac{3+8\varepsilon}{1-2\varepsilon}$, for some $a = a(\varepsilon, e)$, provided $\varepsilon < \frac{1}{4}$. Notice that (6.22) holds for $n = 0$ and assume that it holds also $\forall i \leq n - 1$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} D_n &\stackrel{(6.16)}{\leq} A\delta_{n-1}^{\frac{3}{2}} \left(\frac{D_{n-1}}{\delta_n^2} \right)^{1+\varepsilon} \\ &= A\delta_n^{-1-2\varepsilon} D_{n-1}^{1+\varepsilon} \\ &\leq Aa^{b^n(1+2\varepsilon)+cb^{n-1}(1+\varepsilon)}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, it is sufficient to check as in [DLS12H] that $c = \frac{3+8\varepsilon}{1-2\varepsilon}$ satisfies

$$cb - [b(1+2\varepsilon) + c(1+\varepsilon)] \geq \varepsilon, \quad (6.23)$$

provided $\varepsilon < \frac{1}{4}$. Indeed, if (6.23) holds,

$$D_n \leq Aa^{cb^n} a^{-b^{n-1}\varepsilon}$$

and (6.22) follows provided $a \geq A^{\frac{1}{\varepsilon}}$.

Finally estimate by interpolation

$$\begin{aligned} \|v_n - v_{n-1}\|_{C^\theta} &\leq \|v_n - v_{n-1}\|_{C^0}^{1-\theta} \|v_n - v_{n-1}\|_{C^1}^\theta \\ &\leq a^{(-\frac{1}{2}(1-\theta)+cb\theta)b^{n-1}}, \end{aligned}$$

which tends to zero as $n \rightarrow +\infty$ provided $(-\frac{1}{2}(1-\theta) + cb\theta) < 0$. Hence, by the choice of b and c , if

$$\theta < \frac{1}{1+3c} = \frac{1-2\varepsilon}{10+22\varepsilon},$$

which tends to $\frac{1}{10}$ as ε tends to 0. \square

Remark 6.4. The fact that the admissible initial data for a given energy e are infinitely many can be verified in different ways. Even though we do not pursue this issue in detail here, since there are essentially no new ideas and the calculations would be very similar, one could check as in [Cho12] that the H^{-1} norm of the admissible subsolution and of the starting vector field of the iteration of Proposition 6.1 can be made arbitrarily small. Thus, choosing a starting vector field different from the trivial one (e.g. the vector field of the iteration at step j) and a sufficiently big $a \geq \frac{3}{2}$ in the Definition of the $\{\delta_n\}$ one can find a different admissible initial datum.

7. PROOF OF THEOREM 1.1

Let v_0 be an admissible initial datum for the energy e . From Step 0 to Step 3 we prove the existence of an Hölder solution of (1.1) with exponent $\theta < \frac{1}{16}$ and total kinetic energy e . In Step 4 we give a short proof of the fact that actually there are infinitely many solutions satisfying the same requirements, and we also explain why the admissible initial data for (1.1) w.r.t. any preassigned total kinetic energy are infinitely many, too.

Step 0. Let $(v, p, \mathring{R}) \in C^0(\mathbb{T}^3 \times [0, 1]; \mathbb{R}^3 \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathcal{S}_0^{3 \times 3}) \cap C^1(\mathbb{T}^3 \times (0, 1); \mathbb{R}^3 \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathcal{S}_0^{3 \times 3})$ be an admissible subsolution as in Proposition 6.1 with initial datum v_0 for some $\theta < \frac{1}{10}$ and $\beta = \frac{1}{8}$. W.l.o.g., we assume that $\exists h > 0$ such that e is positive and smooth on the larger time interval $[0, 1+h]$ and (v, p, \mathring{R}) is also defined and satisfies the same properties on $[0, 1+h]$.

Set $(\bar{v}_0, \bar{p}_0, \bar{\mathring{R}}_0) := (v, p, \mathring{R})$, $0 < \varepsilon := \varepsilon(\theta) < 1$, $t_0 = 1$ and introduce, analogously to what we did in the proof of Proposition 6.1, a countable family of cut-off functions

$$\psi_n \in C^\infty([0, 1+h]; [0, 1]) \text{ s.t. } \psi_n(t) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } t \in [t_{n-1}, 1+h] \\ 0 & \text{if } t \in [0, t_{n-1} - \tilde{\ell}_n] = [0, t_n + \tilde{\ell}_n] \end{cases} \quad (7.1)$$

$$\text{and } |\psi'_n| \leq \frac{4}{t_{n-1} - t_n} = \bar{C}\delta_{n-1}^{-\frac{3\varepsilon}{4}}, \quad |\psi''_n| \leq \frac{4 \max |\psi'_n|}{t_{n-1} - t_n} \leq \bar{C}^2\delta_{n-1}^{-\frac{3\varepsilon}{2}}, \quad (7.2)$$

where

$$\tilde{\ell}_n = \frac{2}{\bar{C}}\delta_{n-1}^{\frac{3\varepsilon}{4}} = \frac{1}{2}|t_n - t_{n-1}|,$$

and the following parameters

$$\begin{aligned}
\bar{\delta}_n &= \delta_{n+1}, \\
\dot{\delta}_n &= \varphi_n^2 \delta_n + (1 - \varphi_n^2) \delta_{n-1}, \\
\delta_n^* &= \psi_n^2 \bar{\delta}_n + (1 - \psi_n^2) \dot{\delta}_n \\
\bar{\ell}_n &> 0 \text{ s.t. } \sum_n \bar{\ell}_n < h.
\end{aligned} \tag{7.3}$$

Notice that, in contrast with what happens for the cut-off functions φ_n , the set $\{\psi_n = 1\}$ contains an $\bar{\ell}_{n-1}$ -neighborhood of the support of ψ_{n-1} and then, by (6.3) with $\psi = \psi_{n-1}$, $\varphi = \psi_n$

$$\prod_{i=k}^{\bar{k}} (1 - \psi_i^2) = 1 - \psi_k^2, \quad \prod_{i=k}^{\bar{k}} \psi_i = \psi_k, \quad (1 - \psi_i^2) \psi_j = 0 \text{ if } i > j. \tag{7.4}$$

Assume for the moment that

$$\delta_0 = a^{-1} \leq \frac{1}{4}. \tag{7.5}$$

At the end of the proof it will be easy to notice that this is not a restrictive assumption and the case $\delta_0 = 1$ can be handled with no additional difficulties. If (7.5) holds, we have in particular that $\delta_1 = \delta_0^{\frac{3}{2}} \leq \frac{1}{2} \delta_0$. In particular, by (6.1) and (6.2), $(\bar{v}_0, \bar{p}_0, \bar{R}_0)$ satisfies the assumptions of Proposition 2.2 on $[a_1, a_2] = [t_1, 1 + h]$ with $\varphi = \varphi_1$, $\hat{\delta} = \delta_1$, $\phi \equiv 1$, $\delta' = \delta_0$ and $\beta = \bar{\beta} := \frac{1}{8}$. Set then $\bar{D}_0 := \max\{1, \|\bar{v}_0\|_{C^1([t_1, 1+h])}, \|\bar{p}_0\|_{C^1([t_1, 1+h])}, \|\bar{R}_0\|_{C^1([t_1, 1+h])}\}$, $\ell_0 = 0$ and $0 \equiv \psi_0 \in C^\infty([0, 1 + h]; [0, 1])$.

Starting from $(\bar{v}_0, \bar{p}_0, \bar{R}_0)$ we construct iteratively –using Proposition 2.2– a sequence of solutions $(\bar{v}_n, \bar{p}_n, \bar{R}_n)$ of the Euler-Reynolds system which will converge to a solution $(\bar{v}, \bar{p}, \bar{R})$ of (1.1) with initial datum $\bar{v}_0(0)$.

Step 2. Iterative perturbation step

Let us assume that, after n steps of the iterative procedure there exist $\{\ell_i\}_{i=1}^n$, $0 < \ell_i < \min\{\bar{\ell}_i, \tilde{\ell}_i\}$ and $\{(\bar{v}_i, \bar{p}_i, \bar{R}_i)\}_{i=1}^n$ solutions of (2.1) on $[0, 1 + h - \sum_{i=1}^n \ell_i]$ satisfying

$$\bar{v}_i = \bar{v}_{i-1} + \psi_i \bar{w}_i \tag{7.6}$$

$$\bar{p}_i = \bar{p}_{i-1} + \psi_i \bar{p}_{i0} \tag{7.7}$$

$$\bar{R}_i = \psi_i \bar{R}_{i,1} + \psi_i' \bar{R}_{i,2} + (1 - \psi_i^2) \bar{R}_{i-1} \tag{7.8}$$

and the following estimates

$$\left| e - \int |\bar{v}_i|^2 - \left[\psi_i^2 \bar{\delta}_i + (1 - \psi_i^2) \left(e - \int |\bar{v}_{i-1}|^2 \right) \right] \right| \leq \psi_i \left(\chi_{[t_i, t_{i-1}]} \frac{\bar{\beta}}{2} + \chi_{[t_{i-1}, 1+h - \sum_{j=1}^i \ell_j]} \bar{\beta} \right) \bar{\delta}_i e \tag{7.9}$$

$$\|\bar{v}_i - \bar{v}_{i-1}\|_0 \leq \psi_i M \sqrt{\dot{\delta}_i} \tag{7.10}$$

$$\|\bar{R}_i - (1 - \psi_i^2) \bar{R}_{i-1}\|_0 \leq \chi_{\{\psi_i > 0\}} \eta \bar{\delta}_i \tag{7.11}$$

$$\|\bar{p}_i - \bar{p}_{i-1}\|_0 \leq \psi_i M^2 \dot{\delta}_i \tag{7.12}$$

$$\bar{D}_i \leq A_{i-1} \bar{\delta}_{i-1}^{\frac{3}{2}} \left(\frac{\bar{D}_{i-1}}{\bar{\delta}_i^2} \right)^{1+\varepsilon} \bar{\delta}_i^{-\frac{17}{27} - \frac{4}{9}\varepsilon}, \tag{7.13}$$

where

$$\bar{D}_i := \max\{1, \|\bar{v}_i\|_{C^1}, \|\bar{R}_i\|_{C^1}\}$$

and $A_i = A_i(e, \varepsilon, \|\bar{v}_i\|_{C^0})$.

Claim: Our goal is now to show that $(\bar{v}_n, \bar{p}_n, \bar{R}_n)$ satisfies the assumptions (2.4) and (2.5) of Proposition 2.2 on $[a_1, a_2] = [t_n, 1 + h - \sum_{i=1}^n \ell_i]$ with $\delta^* = \delta_n^*$, $\hat{\delta} = \bar{\delta}_n = \delta_{n+1}$, $\dot{\delta} = \dot{\delta}_n$, $\beta = 2\bar{\beta}$ and on $[a_1, a_2] = [t_{n+1}, t_n]$ with $\delta^* = \dot{\delta}_{n+1}$, $\hat{\delta} = \bar{\delta}_n = \delta_{n+1}$, $\dot{\delta} = \delta_n$, $\beta = \bar{\beta}$.

To this aim, we set

$$\begin{aligned}\psi_i \bar{e}_i &:= e - \int |\bar{v}_i|^2 - \left[\psi_i^2 \bar{\delta}_i + (1 - \psi_i^2) \left(e - \int |\bar{v}_{i-1}|^2 \right) \right], \\ \varphi_i \bar{e}_i &:= \left(e - \int |\bar{v}_0|^2 - \delta_i e \right) \chi_{[t_i, t_{i-1}]}\end{aligned}$$

and rewrite (7.9) for $i = n$ as follows

$$\begin{aligned}e - \int |\bar{v}_n|^2 &= \psi_n^2 \bar{\delta}_n e + (1 - \psi_n^2) \psi_{n-1}^2 \bar{\delta}_{n-1} e + (1 - \psi_n^2) (1 - \psi_{n-1}^2) \left(e - \int |\bar{v}_{n-2}|^2 \right) \\ &\quad + (1 - \psi_n^2) \psi_{n-1} \bar{e}_{n-1} + \psi_n \bar{e}_n \\ &\stackrel{(7.4)}{=} \psi_n^2 \bar{\delta}_n e + (1 - \psi_n^2) \left(e - \int |\bar{v}_{n-2}|^2 \right) + \psi_n \bar{e}_n \\ &\stackrel{(7.6)}{=} \psi_n^2 \bar{\delta}_n e + (1 - \psi_n^2) \left(e - \int |\bar{v}_0|^2 \right) + \psi_n \bar{e}_n \\ &= \chi_{[0, t_n]} \left(e - \int |\bar{v}_0|^2 \right) + \chi_{[t_n, 1+h-\sum_{i=1}^n \ell_i]} \left\{ \left[(1 - \psi_n^2) \bar{\delta}_n + \psi_n^2 \bar{\delta}_n \right] e + (1 - \psi_n^2) \varphi_n \bar{e}_n + \psi_n \bar{e}_n \right\}\end{aligned}\tag{7.14}$$

Since

$$|\bar{e}_n| \leq \frac{\bar{\beta}}{2} \delta_n e, \quad |\bar{e}_n| \leq \frac{\bar{\beta}}{2} \bar{\delta}_n e$$

we find that

$$\begin{aligned}\left| e - \int |\bar{v}_n|^2 - \delta_{n+1} e \right| \chi_{[t_{n+1}, t_n]} &\leq \frac{\bar{\beta}}{2} \delta_{n+1} e \\ \left| e - \int |\bar{v}_n|^2 - \delta_n^* e \right| \chi_{[t_n, 1+h-\sum_{i=1}^n \ell_i]} &\leq \bar{\beta} \delta_n^* e\end{aligned}$$

which means that \bar{v}_n satisfies the assumption (2.4) on $[t_n, 1]$ with $\delta^* = \delta_n^*$, $\beta = 2\bar{\beta} = \frac{1}{4}$ and, being $\bar{v}_n \chi_{[0, t_n]} = \bar{v}_0 \chi_{[0, t_n]}$, it satisfies (2.4) also on $[t_{n+1}, t_n]$ with $\delta^* = \delta_{n+1}^*$, $\bar{\beta} = \beta$.

As for the Reynolds stress tensor, set

$$\chi_{\{\psi_i > 0\}} \bar{\bar{R}}_i := \psi_i \bar{\bar{R}}_{i,1} + \psi' \bar{\bar{R}}_{i,2}$$

and rewrite (7.11) as

$$\begin{aligned}\bar{\bar{R}}_n &= (1 - \psi_n^2) \bar{\bar{R}}_{n-1} + \chi_{\{\psi_n > 0\}} \bar{\bar{R}}_n \\ &= (1 - \psi_n^2) (1 - \psi_{n-1}^2) \bar{\bar{R}}_{n-2} + (1 - \psi_n^2) \chi_{\{\psi_{n-1} > 0\}} \bar{\bar{R}}_{n-1} + \chi_{\{\psi_n > 0\}} \bar{\bar{R}}_n \\ &\stackrel{(7.4)}{=} (1 - \psi_n^2) \bar{\bar{R}}_0 + \chi_{\{\psi_n > 0\}} \bar{\bar{R}}_n \\ &= \chi_{[0, t_n]} \bar{\bar{R}}_0 + \left[(1 - \psi_n^2) \bar{\bar{R}}_0 + \chi_{\{\psi_n > 0\}} \bar{\bar{R}}_n \right] \chi_{[t_n, 1]}.\end{aligned}$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned}\|\bar{\bar{R}}_n - (1 - \varphi_{n+1}^2) \bar{\bar{R}}'_{n+1}\|_0 \chi_{[t_{n+1}, t_n]} &\leq \chi_{\{\varphi_{n+1} > 0\}} \eta \bar{\delta}_n, \\ \|\bar{\bar{R}}'_{n+1}\|_0 &\leq \eta \bar{\delta}_{n-1} \\ \|\bar{\bar{R}}_n - (1 - \psi_n^2) \bar{\bar{R}}_0\|_0 \chi_{[t_n, 1+h-\sum_{i=1}^n \ell_i]} &\leq \chi_{\{\psi_n > 0\}} \eta \bar{\delta}_n, \\ \|\chi_{[t_n, t_{n-1}]} \bar{\bar{R}}_0\|_0 &\leq (1 - \varphi_n^2) \eta \bar{\delta}_{n-1} + \chi_{\{\varphi_n > 0\}} \eta \bar{\delta}_n \leq 2\eta \bar{\delta}_n\end{aligned}\tag{7.15}$$

Even though the last inequality (7.15) differs from the last in 2.5 by a factor 2, choosing η eventually smaller we can reduce to the assumptions of Proposition 2.2. Hence, our claim is proved and we can apply Proposition 2.2 on $[a_1, a_2] = [t_{n+1}, 1+h-\sum_{i=1}^n \ell_i]$ with $\psi = \psi_{n+1}$, $\bar{\delta} = \bar{\delta}_{n+1} = \delta_{n+2}$.

Thus we get (7.6)-(7.13) where n is replaced by $n + 1$ on the time interval $[t_{n+1} + \ell_{n+1}, 1 + h - \sum_{i=1}^{n+1} \ell_i]$, $\ell_{n+1} < \min\{\tilde{\ell}_{n+1}, \bar{\ell}_{n+1}\}$.

Now observe that, since $\psi_{n+1} = 0$ on $[0, t_{n+1} + \ell_{n+1}]$, we can extend trivially v_{n+1} to be equal to v_n , p_{n+1} to p_n and \tilde{R}_{n+1} to \tilde{R}_n on $[0, t_{n+1} + \ell_{n+1}]$ and moreover also (7.6)-(7.13) extend to the larger time interval $[0, 1 + h - \sum_{i=1}^{n+1} \ell_i]$.

Step 2: Convergence to a solution

By (7.3), the functions $\{(\bar{v}_n, \bar{p}_n, \bar{R}_n)\}$ are well defined on $\mathbb{T}^3 \times [0, 1]$.

From (7.10), (7.11) and (7.12) we immediately get that

$$\exists (\bar{v}, \bar{p}, \bar{R}) \in C^0(\mathbb{T}^3 \times [0, 1]; \mathbb{R}^3 \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathcal{S}_0^{3 \times 3}) \text{ s.t. } \lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \|\bar{v}_n - \bar{v}\|_{C^0} + \|\bar{p}_n - \bar{p}\|_{C^0} + \|\bar{R}_n - \bar{R}\|_{C^0} = 0.$$

In particular, there exists a constant $A = A(\varepsilon, e, \bar{C})$ such that

$$A_n \leq A, \quad \forall n \in \mathbb{N},$$

and from now onwards we will substitute it to A_n into (7.13).

Moreover, $\bar{R} \equiv 0$, $\bar{v}(0) = \bar{v}_0(0)$ and, by (7.14), $e = \int |\bar{v}|^2$ for all $t \in [0, 1]$.

Step 3: Convergence in the Hölder norm To show that the sequence $\{\bar{v}_n(t)\}$ converges to $\bar{v}(t)$ in $C^\theta(\mathbb{T}^3; \mathbb{R}^3)$ with exponent $\theta < \frac{1}{16}$ we use the same argument of [DLS12H], as in Proposition 6.1. Let us find $c > 0$ s.t., $\forall n \in \mathbb{N}$

$$\bar{D}_n \leq a^{cb^{n+1}} \tag{7.16}$$

for some $a = a(\varepsilon, e)$. Notice that (7.16) holds for $n = 0$ and assume that it holds also $\forall i \leq n - 1$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{D}_n &\stackrel{(7.13)}{\leq} A \delta_{n-1}^{\frac{3}{2}} \left(\frac{\bar{D}_{n-1}}{\delta_{n-1}^2} \right)^{1+\varepsilon} \delta_n^{-\frac{17}{27} - \frac{4}{9}\varepsilon} \\ &= A \delta_n^{\frac{3}{2}} \left(\frac{\bar{D}_{n-1}}{\delta_{n+1}^2} \right)^{1+\varepsilon} \delta_{n+1}^{-\frac{17}{27} - \frac{4}{9}\varepsilon} \\ &\leq A a^{-\frac{3}{2}b^n + b^{n+1}} \left(2(1+\varepsilon) + \frac{17}{27} + \frac{4}{9}\varepsilon \right) + cb^n(1+\varepsilon) \\ &= A a^{b^n} \left[c(1+\varepsilon) + b \left(\frac{44}{27} + \frac{22}{9}\varepsilon \right) \right] \end{aligned}$$

as in the proof of Proposition 6.1, it is enough to check that $c = \frac{2(22+42\varepsilon)}{9(1-2\varepsilon)}$ satisfies

$$cb + -c(1 + \varepsilon) - b \left(\frac{44}{27} + \frac{22}{9}\varepsilon \right) \geq \varepsilon. \tag{7.17}$$

provided e.g. $\varepsilon < \frac{1}{4}$. If (7.17) holds, then

$$\bar{D}_n \leq A a^{cb^{n+1}} a^{-\frac{b^n}{\varepsilon}}$$

and (7.16) follows provided $a \geq A^{\frac{1}{\varepsilon}}$.

Finally estimate by interpolation

$$\begin{aligned} \|v_n - v_{n-1}\|_{C^\theta} &\leq \|v_n - v_{n-1}\|_{C^0}^{1-\theta} \|v_n - v_{n-1}\|_{C^1}^\theta \\ &\leq a^{(-\frac{1}{2}(1-\theta) + cb\theta)b^{n-1}}, \end{aligned}$$

which tends to zero as $n \rightarrow +\infty$ provided $(-\frac{1}{2}(1-\theta) + cb\theta) < 0$. Hence, by the choice of b and c and letting ε tend to 0, if $\theta < \frac{3}{47}$ and in particular $\theta < \frac{1}{16}$.

Step 4: Infinitely many solutions As in Remark (6.4), one could try to adapt the argument of [Cho12] and show that the velocity field of a solution of (1.1) constructed as in Steps 0-3 can be made arbitrarily H^{-1} close to the velocity field of the original subsolution. Since for any admissible initial datum there clearly exist infinitely many subsolutions, this would conclude the proof of Theorem 1.1.

If the total kinetic energy is a constant, one can also argue in the following way. First notice that, given any admissible initial datum v_0 and any time $s \in (0, 1)$, one can construct an admissible subsolution (v_s, p_s, \tilde{R}_s) as in Proposition 6.1, but supported in $[0, s]$. In the same way, given any other admissible

initial datum \bar{v}_0 let $(\bar{v}_s, \bar{p}_s, \bar{R}_s)$ be an admissible subsolution supported in $[0, s)$. Then, starting from the triple

$$(\tilde{v}_s, \tilde{p}_s, \tilde{R}_s)(x, t) = \begin{cases} (v_s, p_s, \dot{R}_s)(x, t - ks) & \text{if } t \in [ks, (k+1)s] \\ (\bar{v}_s, \bar{p}_s, \bar{R}_s)(x, (k+2)s - t) & \text{if } t \in [(k+1)s, (k+2)s] \\ (\bar{v}_s, \bar{p}_s, \bar{R}_s)(x, t - (k+2)s) & \text{if } t \in [(k+2)s, (k+3)s] \\ (v_s, p_s, \dot{R}_s)(x, (k+4)s - t) & \text{if } t \in [(k+3)s, (k+4)s] \end{cases}$$

for every $k \in 4\mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$, one can construct as in Steps 0-3 –but with cut-off functions that on $[k, (k+2)s]$ are symmetric w.r.t. $(k+1)s$ and on $[(k+2)s, (k+4)s]$ are symmetric w.r.t. $(k+3)s$ – a $4s$ -periodic Hölder solution (\hat{v}_s, \hat{p}_s) of (1.1) which satisfies

$$\hat{v}_s(ks) = v_s(0) = v_0, \quad \hat{v}_s((k+2)s) = \bar{v}_s(0) = \bar{v}_0. \quad (7.18)$$

As s varies in $(0, 1)$, among these solutions there must be infinitely many different ones, because otherwise the only solution would be constant, thus contradicting (7.18).

8. CONTINUOUS SOLUTIONS

Definition 8.1 (Continuous subsolutions). Let $v_0 \in C^0(\mathbb{T}^3; \mathbb{R}^3)$ such that $\int |v_0|^2 = e(0)$. We say that a triple $(v, p, \dot{R}) \in C^0(\mathbb{T}^3 \times [0, 1]; \mathbb{R}^3 \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathcal{S}_0^{3 \times 3}) \cap C^1(\mathbb{T}^3 \times (0, 1); \mathbb{R}^3 \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathcal{S}_0^{3 \times 3})$ is a *continuous subsolution* of the Cauchy problem (1.1) with initial datum v_0 if it solves (2.1) on $\mathbb{T}^3 \times (0, 1)$ and $\exists \{t_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \subset (0, 1)$ with t_n decreasing to 0 as $n \rightarrow +\infty$, $\{\delta_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \subset (0, \frac{1}{2})$ with $\delta_n \leq \frac{1}{2}\delta_{n-1}$, $t_0 = 1$ such that

$$\frac{(e(t) - \int |v(t)|^2)(1 - \delta_n)}{3(2\pi)^3} \text{Id} - \dot{R}(x, t) \in \mathcal{M}_3 \quad \forall t \in [t_n, t_{n-1}], x \in \mathbb{T}^3 \quad (8.1)$$

$$\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \max_{[t_n, t_{n-1}]} \sqrt{e - \int_{\mathbb{T}^3} |v|^2} < +\infty, \quad (8.2)$$

$$v(0) = v_0, \quad \dot{R}(0) \equiv 0.$$

Notice that, by (1.3), (8.1) is equivalent to

$$\frac{(e(t) - \int |v(t)|^2)(1 - \delta_n)}{6(2\pi)^3} \text{Id} - \dot{R}(x, t) \in \mathcal{S}_+^{3 \times 3} \quad \forall t \in (0, 1].$$

Definition 8.2 (Admissible initial data). We say that $v_0 \in C^0(\mathbb{T}^3; \mathbb{R}^3)$ is an *admissible initial datum* for the continuous Cauchy problem (1.1) with prescribed kinetic energy e if $\int |v_0|^2 = e(0)$ and there exists a continuous subsolution as in Definition 8.1 with initial datum v_0 .

Proposition 8.3. *Given an admissible initial datum v_0 for the continuous Cauchy problem (1.1), there exist infinitely continuous solutions of (1.1) with initial datum v_0 .*

Proposition 8.4. *There exist infinitely many admissible initial data for the continuous Cauchy problem (1.1).*

Remark 8.5. In the proofs of Propositions 8.3 and 8.4 we respectively show that there exist a solution and an admissible initial datum. The fact that they are infinitely many follows as in the Proofs of Theorem 1.1 and Proposition 6.1, therefore we omit the details.

The main step in the proof of both Propositions 8.3 and 8.4 consists in being able to add to a subsolution a perturbation term in such a way that the system (2.1) is still satisfied and both the energy gap and the supremum norm of the Reynolds stress are reduced, while keeping the C^0 norm of the new subsolution controlled by a sufficiently small parameter. The global character of our result is gained via multiplication by suitable time-dependent cut-off functions.

Proposition 8.6. *Let $e > 0$, $e \in C^\infty([a_1, a_2])$. Then $\exists M > 0$ depending only on e such that the following holds. Let $(v, p, \mathring{R}) \in C^1(\mathbb{T}^3 \times [a_1, a_2]; \mathbb{R}^3 \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathcal{S}_0^{3 \times 3})$ solving (2.1) and satisfying*

$$\frac{(e - \int |v|^2)(1 - \delta)}{3(2\pi)^3} \text{Id} - \mathring{R} \in \mathcal{M}_3, \quad \forall t \in [a_1, a_2], x \in \mathbb{T}^3 \quad (8.3)$$

for some $0 < \delta \leq \frac{1}{2}$ and let $\psi \in C^1([a_1, a_2]; [0, 1])$, $\bar{\delta} \leq \frac{1}{2}\delta$. Then, there exists $(v_1, p_1, \mathring{R}_1) \in C^1(\mathbb{T}^3 \times [a_1, a_2]; \mathbb{R}^3 \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathcal{S}_0^{3 \times 3})$ which solves (2.1) and satisfies, for all $t \in [a_1, a_2]$:

$$v_1 = v + \psi w_1 \quad (8.4)$$

$$\mathring{R}_1 = (1 - \psi^2)\mathring{R} + \psi \mathring{R}_{1,1} + \psi' \mathring{R}_{1,2} \quad (8.5)$$

$$p_1 = p - \psi^2 p_o \quad (8.6)$$

together with the following estimates

$$\|v_1 - v\|_0 \leq \psi M \sqrt{\Delta} \quad (8.7)$$

$$\left| e - \int_{\mathbb{T}^3} |v_1|^2 - [\psi^2 \delta \Delta + (1 - \psi^2) \Delta] \right| \leq \psi \bar{\delta} \min_{[a_1, a_2]} \Delta \quad (8.8)$$

$$\|p_1 - p\|_0 \leq \psi^2 M^2 \Delta \quad (8.9)$$

$$\|\mathring{R}_1 - (1 - \psi^2)\mathring{R}\|_0 \leq \chi_{\{\psi > 0\}} \eta \bar{\delta}, \quad (8.10)$$

where

$$\Delta(t) := e(t) - \int_{\mathbb{T}^3} |v|^2(t)$$

and η is given by

$$\eta = \frac{r_0}{12(2\pi)^3} \min_{[a_1, a_2]} \Delta, \quad (8.11)$$

with $r_0 > 0$ as in Lemma 3.2.

Remark 8.7. Notice that, if $(v_1, p_1, \mathring{R}_1)$ is as in Proposition 8.6, then

$$\frac{(e - \int |v_1|^2)(1 - \bar{\delta})}{3(2\pi)^3} \text{Id} - \mathring{R}_1 \in \mathcal{M}_3, \quad \forall t \in [a_1, a_2], x \in \mathbb{T}^3. \quad (8.12)$$

In order to prove (8.12), we first observe by (8.8) that

$$(e - \int |v_1|^2)(1 - \bar{\delta}) = (1 - \psi^2)\Delta(1 - \bar{\delta}) + \psi^2\Delta(1 - \bar{\delta})\delta + \psi(1 - \bar{\delta})f_1,$$

with $|f_1| \leq \bar{\delta} \min_{[a_1, a_2]} \Delta$. Then, by (8.5)

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{(e - \int |v_1|^2)(1 - \bar{\delta})}{3(2\pi)^3} \text{Id} - \mathring{R}_1 &= (1 - \psi^2) \left[\frac{\Delta(1 - \delta)}{3(2\pi)^3} \text{Id} - \mathring{R} \right] \\ &+ \frac{(1 - \psi^2)\Delta(\delta - \bar{\delta}) + \psi^2\Delta(1 - \bar{\delta})\delta + \psi f_1(1 - \bar{\delta})}{3(2\pi)^3} \text{Id} \\ &- \psi \mathring{R}_{1,1} - \psi' \mathring{R}_{1,2}. \end{aligned} \quad (8.13)$$

The summand in (8.13) belongs to \mathcal{M}_3 by (8.3). As for the remaining terms, since $\delta \leq \frac{1}{2}$ and $\bar{\delta} \leq \frac{1}{2}\delta$,

$$\begin{aligned} \left| (1 - \psi^2)\Delta(\delta - \bar{\delta}) + \psi^2\Delta(1 - \bar{\delta})\delta + \psi f_1(1 - \bar{\delta}) \right| &\geq \min_{[a_1, a_2]} \Delta \left[\delta + \bar{\delta}(\psi^2(1 - \delta) - \psi(1 - \bar{\delta}) - 1) \right] \\ &\geq \min_{[a_1, a_2]} \Delta \left[\delta - \bar{\delta} - \bar{\delta} \frac{(1 - \bar{\delta})^2}{4(1 - \delta)} \right] \\ &\geq \min_{[a_1, a_2]} \Delta \left[\frac{\delta}{2} - \frac{\delta(1 - \bar{\delta})^2}{2} \right] \\ &\geq \min_{[a_1, a_2]} \Delta \frac{\delta}{4}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, by (8.10) and (8.11)

$$\frac{\|\psi\mathring{R}_{1,1} + \psi'\mathring{R}_{1,2}\|_0 3(2\pi)^3}{\left| (1 - \psi^2)\Delta(\delta - \bar{\delta}) + \psi^2\Delta(1 - \bar{\delta})\delta + \psi f_1(1 - \bar{\delta}) \right|} \leq r_0.$$

Proof of Proposition 8.6. $(v_1, p_1, \mathring{R}_1)$ is constructed as in the proof of Proposition 2.2, but replacing v_ℓ , \mathring{R}_ℓ with v and \mathring{R} , and ρ_ℓ , R_ℓ respectively with

$$\begin{aligned} \rho(t) &= \frac{1}{3(2\pi)^3} \Delta(1 - \delta), \\ R(x, t) &= \rho(t)\text{Id} - \mathring{R}(x, t). \end{aligned}$$

More precisely, we define

$$\begin{aligned} w_o(x, t) &:= \psi \sum_{j=1}^8 \sum_{k \in \Lambda_j} \sqrt{\rho(t)} \gamma_k^{(j)} \left(\frac{R(x, t)}{\rho(t)} \right) \phi_{k, \mu}^{(j)}(v(x, t), \lambda t) B_k e^{ik \cdot \lambda x}, \\ w_c &:= -Qw_o \\ v_1 &:= \psi w_o + \psi w_c \\ p_1 &:= p - \psi^2 \frac{|w_o|^2}{2} \\ \mathring{R}_1 &:= (1 - \psi^2)\mathring{R} + \psi^2 \mathcal{R} \left[\text{div} \left(w_1 \otimes w_1 + \mathring{R} - \frac{|w_o|^2}{2} \text{Id} \right) \right] + \psi \mathcal{R} [\partial_t w_1 + \text{div} (w_1 \otimes v + v \otimes w_1)] + \psi' \mathcal{R}(w_1), \end{aligned} \tag{8.14}$$

assuming w.l.o.g. that

$$\mu, \lambda, \frac{\lambda}{\mu} \in \mathbb{N}, \quad \mu \geq \Delta^{-1}.$$

In order to show that the main perturbation term ψw_o is well defined, it is then sufficient to show that $\frac{\mathring{R}}{\rho} \in \mathcal{N}$, where $\mathcal{N} \subset \mathcal{M}_3$ satisfies the assumptions of Lemma 3.2. To this aim it is sufficient to notice that

$$\frac{\mathring{R}}{\rho} \in \mathcal{M}_3 \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad \text{Id} - \frac{3(2\pi)^3}{\left(e - \int |v|^2 \right) (1 - \delta)} \mathring{R} \in \mathcal{M}_3, \tag{8.15}$$

which is precisely (8.3).

Reasoning as in the proof of Proposition 2.2, we get the analogue of Proposition 6.1 of [DLS12] for the coefficients $a_k(s, y, \tau) = \sqrt{\rho(s)} \gamma_k^{(j)} \left(\frac{R(y, s)}{\rho(s)} \right) \phi_{k, \mu}^{(j)}(v(y, s), \tau)$, namely

$$\|\psi a_k(\cdot, s, \tau)\|_r \leq \psi(s) C \sqrt{\Delta} \mu^r \tag{8.16}$$

$$\|\partial_\tau \psi a_k(\cdot, s, \tau)\|_r \leq \psi(s) C \sqrt{\Delta} \mu^r \tag{8.17}$$

$$\|(\partial_\tau \psi a_k + i(k \cdot v) \psi a_k)(\cdot, s, \tau)\|_r \leq \psi(s) C \sqrt{\Delta} \mu^{r-1} \tag{8.18}$$

$$\|\partial_s \psi a_k(\cdot, s, \tau)\|_r \leq \psi(s) C \sqrt{\Delta} \mu^{r+1} + |\psi'(s)| C \sqrt{\Delta} \mu^r. \tag{8.19}$$

We also have

$$\psi W_o \otimes \psi W_o(y, s, \tau, \xi) = \psi^2(s) R(y, s) + \psi^2(s) \sum_{1 \leq |k| \leq 2\lambda_0} U_k(y, s, \tau) e^{ik \cdot \xi}, \tag{8.20}$$

where $U_k \in C^\infty(\mathbb{T}^3 \times [a_1, a_2] \times \mathbb{R})$ satisfy

$$U_k k = \frac{1}{2} (\text{tr} U_k) k \tag{8.21}$$

and the following estimates for any $r \geq 0$:

$$\|\psi^2 U_k(\cdot, s, \tau)\|_r \leq C\psi^2(s)\Delta\mu^r; \quad (8.22)$$

$$\|\partial_\tau \psi^2 U_k(\cdot, s, \tau)\|_r \leq C\psi^2(s)\Delta\mu^r; \quad (8.23)$$

$$\|\partial_s \psi^2 U_k(\cdot, s, \tau)\|_r \leq C\psi^2(s)\Delta\mu^{r+1} + C|\psi'(s)|\Delta\mu^r; \quad (8.24)$$

$$\|\partial_\tau \psi^2 U_k + i(k \cdot v)\psi^2 U_k(\cdot, s, \tau)\|_r \leq C\psi^2(s)\Delta\mu^{r-1}. \quad (8.25)$$

Notice that the above estimates are the same as in Proposition 6.1 of [DLS12] up to replacing δ with Δ everywhere and multiplying them by suitable powers of ψ and its derivatives. Moreover, the constants C may now depend, in contrast with the estimates for the Hölder continuous case, also on C^r norms of v and \dot{R} .

From (8.16)-(8.25) we deduce as in Sections 5.2 and 5.3 the following estimates:

$$\begin{aligned} \|\psi w_o\|_r &\leq \sqrt{\Delta}\lambda^r, & \forall r \geq 0 \\ \|\psi w_c\|_\alpha &\leq \sqrt{\Delta}\mu\lambda^{\alpha-1}, & \forall \alpha > 0 \\ \left| e - \int_{\mathbb{T}^3} |v_1|^2 - [\psi^2 \delta \Delta + (1 - \psi^2)\Delta] \right| &\leq C\mu\lambda^{\alpha-1}, \end{aligned}$$

for any $\alpha \in \left(0, \frac{\omega}{1+\omega}\right)$.

Finally, setting

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{R}_{1,1} &:= \psi \mathcal{R} \left[\operatorname{div} (w_1 \otimes w_1 + \dot{R} - \frac{|w_o|^2}{2} \operatorname{Id}) \right] + \mathcal{R} [\partial_t w_1 + \operatorname{div} (w_1 \otimes v + v \otimes w_1)], \\ \dot{R}_{1,2} &:= \mathcal{R}(w_1) \end{aligned}$$

the Reynolds stress tensor $\dot{R}_1 = (1 - \psi^2)\dot{R}_0 + \psi\dot{R}_{1,1} + \psi'\dot{R}_{1,2}$ can be estimated as in Section 5.4 as follows

$$\|\dot{R}_1 - (1 - \psi^2)\dot{R}_0\|_0 \leq \psi C [\sqrt{\Delta}\mu\lambda^{\alpha-1} + \sqrt{\Delta}\mu^{-1}\lambda^\alpha] + |\psi'| C \sqrt{\Delta}\mu\lambda^{\alpha-1}.$$

Since $\mu \leq \lambda$, we conclude that there exists a suitable choice of α , μ and λ for which (8.7)-(8.10) hold. \square

Proof of Proposition 8.4. Let $(v_0, p_0, \dot{R}_0) \equiv 0$. Observe that it trivially satisfies the assumptions of Proposition 8.6 on $[a_1, a_2] = [0, 1]$ with $\delta = \frac{1}{2}$. Set $\delta_0 = \frac{1}{2}$, $\Delta_0 = \left(e - \int |v_0|^2\right) = e$, $t_0 = 1$, $\psi_0 \equiv 1$, $\delta_n = \frac{1}{2^{n+1}}$, $\{t_n\} \subset (0, 1)$ decreasing to 0 and $\varphi_n \in C^1([0, 1]; [0, 1])$ s.t.

$$\varphi_n = \begin{cases} 1 & [0, t_n] \\ 0 & [t_{n-1}, 1] \end{cases}$$

Notice that the functions $\psi = \varphi_n$, $\varphi = \varphi_{n-1}$ satisfy (6.3) for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. In particular,

$$\prod_{i=k}^{\bar{k}} (1 - \varphi_i^2) = 1 - \varphi_k^2, \quad \prod_{i=k}^{\bar{k}} \varphi_i = \varphi_{\bar{k}}, \quad (1 - \varphi_i^2)\varphi_j = 0 \text{ if } i < j. \quad (8.26)$$

Step 1. Iterative perturbation step

Let us assume that, after n steps of the iteration there exist $\{(v_i, p_i, \dot{R}_i)\}_{i=1}^n$ solutions of (2.1) on $[0, 1]$ satisfying

$$\left| e - \int |v_i|^2 - [\varphi_i^2 \Delta_{i-1} \delta_{i-1} + (1 - \varphi_i^2) \Delta_{i-1}] \right| \leq \varphi_i \delta_i \min_{[0, t_{i-1}]} \Delta_{i-1} \quad (8.27)$$

$$\|v_i - v_{i-1}\|_0 = \|\varphi_i w_i\|_0 \leq \varphi_i M \sqrt{\Delta_{i-1}} \quad (8.28)$$

$$\|\dot{R}_i - (1 - \varphi_i^2)\dot{R}_{i-1}\|_0 \leq \chi_{\{\varphi_i > 0\}} \eta_i \delta_i \quad (8.29)$$

$$\|p_i - p_{i-1}\|_0 \leq \varphi_i^2 M^2 \Delta_{i-1}, \quad (8.30)$$

where

$$\Delta_i = e - \int_{\mathbb{T}^3} |v_i|^2, \quad \eta_i = \frac{r_0}{12(2\pi)^3} \min_{[0, t_{i-1}]} \Delta_{i-1},$$

and

$$\frac{\left(e - \int |v_i|^2\right)(1 - \delta_i)}{3(2\pi)^3} \text{Id} - \mathring{R}_i \in \mathcal{M}_3, \quad \forall t \in [0, t_{i-1}]. \quad (8.31)$$

In particular,

$$v_i = v_{i-1}, \quad p_i = p_{i-1}, \quad \mathring{R}_i = \mathring{R}_{i-1} \quad \text{on } [t_{i-1}, 1].$$

Since $\text{supp } \varphi_{n+1} \subset [0, t_n]$, we can apply Proposition 2.2 to $(v_n, p_n, \mathring{R}_n)$ with $\bar{\delta} = \delta_{n+1}$, $\psi = \varphi_{n+1}$ and get $(v_{n+1}, p_{n+1}, \mathring{R}_{n+1})$ solutions of (2.1) on $[0, 1]$ satisfying (8.27)-(8.31) with $i = n + 1$.

Step 2. Convergence to a subsolution Being

$$v_m \chi_{[t_n, t_{n-1}]} = v_n \chi_{[t_n, t_{n-1}]}, \quad p_m \chi_{[t_n, t_{n-1}]} = p_n \chi_{[t_n, t_{n-1}]}, \quad \mathring{R}_m \chi_{[t_n, t_{n-1}]} = \mathring{R}_n \chi_{[t_n, t_{n-1}]} \quad \forall m \geq n \in \mathbb{N}, \quad (8.32)$$

$(v_n, p_n, \mathring{R}_n) \rightarrow (v, p, \mathring{R})$ in $C^0(\mathbb{T}^3 \times (0, 1]; \mathbb{R}^3 \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathcal{S}_0^{3 \times 3})$, where (v, p, \mathring{R}) solves the Euler-Reynolds system (2.1) and satisfies (8.1) on $\mathbb{T}^3 \times (0, 1)$.

To show full convergence on $[0, 1]$ to a subsolution, we have to prove

$$\sum_{n=1}^{+\infty} \max_{[0, t_{n-1}]} \sqrt{\Delta_{n-1}} < +\infty. \quad (8.33)$$

Indeed, if (8.33) holds, not only $(v_n, p_n, \mathring{R}_n) \rightarrow (v, p, \mathring{R})$ in $C^0(\mathbb{T}^3 \times [0, 1])$, but also $\mathring{R}(0) \equiv 0$ and $e(0) = \int_{\mathbb{T}^3} |v(0)|^2$. Moreover, by (8.32) and (8.27), v also satisfies (8.2).

Set

$$\varphi_i f_i := e - \int |v_i|^2 - [\varphi_i^2 \Delta_{i-1} \delta_{i-1} + (1 - \varphi_i^2) \Delta_{i-1}].$$

Expanding (8.27) for $i = n$ we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta_n &= \varphi_n^2 \delta_{n-1} \Delta_{n-1} + (1 - \varphi_n^2) \Delta_{n-1} + \varphi_n f_n \\ &= \varphi_n^2 \varphi_{n-1}^2 \delta_{n-1} \delta_{n-2} \Delta_{n-2} + \varphi_n^2 (1 - \varphi_{n-1}^2) \delta_{n-1} \Delta_{n-2} + (1 - \varphi_n^2) \varphi_{n-1}^2 \delta_{n-2} \Delta_{n-2} \\ &\quad + (1 - \varphi_n^2) (1 - \varphi_{n-1}^2) \Delta_{n-2} + \varphi_n^2 \varphi_{n-1} \delta_{n-1} f_{n-1} + (1 - \varphi_n^2) \varphi_{n-1} f_{n-1} + \varphi_n f_n \\ &\stackrel{(8.26)}{=} \varphi_n^2 \delta_{n-1} \delta_{n-2} \Delta_{n-2} + (1 - \varphi_n^2) \varphi_{n-1}^2 \delta_{n-2} \Delta_{n-2} + (1 - \varphi_{n-1}^2) \Delta_{n-2} + \varphi_n^2 \delta_{n-1} f_{n-1} \\ &\quad + (1 - \varphi_n^2) \varphi_{n-1} f_{n-1} + \varphi_n f_n. \end{aligned}$$

Hence

$$\Delta_n \chi_{[0, t_n]} = \delta_{n-1} \delta_{n-2} \Delta_{n-2} + \delta_{n-1} f_{n-1} + f_n = \left(\prod_{j=0}^{n-1} \delta_j \right) \Delta_0 + \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \left(\prod_{j=i}^{n-1} \delta_j \right) f_i + f_n$$

which, by the choice of the δ_n and (8.27), implies (8.33). \square

Proof of Proposition 8.3. Let $(\bar{v}_0, \bar{p}_0, \bar{R}_0)$ be a subsolution and set $\bar{\Delta}_0 = e - \int |\bar{v}_0|^2$. Let $\bar{\delta}_n = \delta_{n+1}$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$. Let $t_0 = 1$, $\{t_n\}$, $\bar{\delta}_0$, $\{\bar{\delta}_n\}$ as in Definition 8.1 and $\psi_0 \equiv 0$, $\psi_n \in C^1([0, 1])$ s.t.

$$\psi_n = \begin{cases} 1 & [t_{n-1}, 1] \\ 0 & [0, t_n] \end{cases}$$

Notice that the functions $\psi = \psi_{n-1}$, $\varphi = \psi_n$ satisfy (6.3) for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. As a consequence,

$$\prod_{i=k}^{\bar{k}} (1 - \psi_i^2) = 1 - \psi_{\bar{k}}^2, \quad \prod_{i=k}^{\bar{k}} \psi_i = \psi_{\bar{k}}, \quad (1 - \psi_i^2) \psi_j = 0 \text{ if } i > j. \quad (8.34)$$

Observe that $(\bar{v}_0, \bar{p}_0, \bar{R}_0)$ satisfies the assumptions of Proposition 8.6 on $[a_1, a_2] = [t_1, t_0]$ with $\delta = \bar{\delta}_0$.

Step 2. Iterative perturbation step

Let us assume that, after n steps, there exist $\{(\bar{v}_i, \bar{p}_i, \bar{R}_i)\}_{i=1}^n$ solutions of (2.1) on $[0, 1]$ satisfying

$$\left| e - \int |\bar{v}_i|^2 - \left[\psi_i^2 \bar{\delta}_{i-1} \bar{\Delta}_{i-1} + (1 - \psi_i^2) \bar{\Delta}_{i-1} \right] \right| \leq \psi_i \bar{\delta}_i \min_{[t_i, 1]} \bar{\Delta}_{i-1} \quad (8.35)$$

$$\|\bar{v}_i - \bar{v}_{i-1}\|_0 \leq \psi_i M \sqrt{\bar{\Delta}_{i-1}} \quad (8.36)$$

$$\|\bar{R}_i - (1 - \psi_i^2) \bar{R}_{i-1}\|_0 \leq \chi_{\{\psi_i > 0\}} \eta_i \bar{\delta}_i \quad (8.37)$$

$$\|\bar{p}_i - \bar{p}_{i-1}\|_0 \leq \psi_i^2 M^2 \bar{\Delta}_{i-1} \quad (8.38)$$

$$(8.39)$$

with

$$\bar{\Delta}_i = e - \int |\bar{v}_i|^2, \quad \eta_i = \frac{r_0}{12(2\pi)^3} \min_{[t_i, 1]} \bar{\Delta}_{i-1}.$$

and

$$\frac{(e - \int |\bar{v}_i|^2)(1 - \bar{\delta}_i)}{3(2\pi)^3} \text{Id} - \bar{R}_i \in \mathcal{M}_3, \quad \forall t \in [t_{i+1}, 1]. \quad (8.40)$$

Observe that

$$v_i = v_{i-1}, \quad p_i = p_{i-1}, \quad \dot{R}_i = \dot{R}_{i-1} \quad \text{on } [0, t_i]. \quad (8.41)$$

Thus we can apply Proposition 8.6 to $(\bar{v}_n, \bar{p}_n, \bar{R}_n)$ on $[a_1, a_2] = [t_{n+1}, 1]$ with $\bar{\delta} = \bar{\delta}_{n+1}$, $\psi = \psi_{n+1}$ and get $(\bar{v}_{n+1}, \bar{p}_{n+1}, \bar{R}_{n+1})$ satisfying (8.35)-(8.38) with $i = n+1$. By Remark 8.7 $(\bar{v}_{n+1}, \bar{p}_{n+1}, \bar{R}_{n+1})$ satisfies (8.40) on $[t_{n+1}, 1]$. Since, by (8.41), $(\bar{v}_{n+1}, \bar{p}_{n+1}, \bar{R}_{n+1}) \equiv (\bar{v}_0, \bar{p}_0, \bar{R}_0)$ on $[0, t_{n+1}]$, then, by (8.1), (8.40) holds also on $[t_{n+2}, t_{n+1}]$.

Step 2. Convergence to a solution As in the proof of Proposition 8.4, we have to show that

$$\sum_{n=1}^{+\infty} \max_{[t_n, 1]} \sqrt{\bar{\Delta}_{n-1}} < +\infty. \quad (8.42)$$

Set

$$\psi_i \bar{f}_i := \bar{\Delta}_i - [\psi_i^2 \bar{\delta}_{i-1} \bar{\Delta}_{i-1} + (1 - \psi_i^2) \bar{\Delta}_{i-1}].$$

Expanding (8.35) we get

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{\Delta}_n &= \psi_n^2 \bar{\delta}_{n-1} \bar{\Delta}_{n-1} + (1 - \psi_n^2) \bar{\Delta}_{n-1} + \psi_n \bar{f}_n \\ &= \psi_n^2 \psi_{n-1}^2 \bar{\delta}_{n-1} \bar{\delta}_{n-2} \bar{\Delta}_{n-2} + \psi_n^2 (1 - \psi_{n-1}^2) \bar{\delta}_{n-1} \bar{\Delta}_{n-2} + (1 - \psi_n^2) \psi_{n-1}^2 \bar{\delta}_{n-2} \bar{\Delta}_{n-2} \\ &\quad + (1 - \psi_n^2) (1 - \psi_{n-1}^2) \bar{\Delta}_{n-2} + \psi_n^2 \psi_{n-1} \bar{\delta}_{n-1} \bar{f}_{n-1} + (1 - \psi_n^2) \psi_{n-1} \bar{f}_{n-1} + \psi_n \bar{f}_n \\ &\stackrel{(8.34)}{=} \psi_{n-1}^2 \bar{\delta}_{n-1} \bar{\delta}_{n-2} \bar{\Delta}_{n-2} + \psi_n^2 (1 - \psi_{n-1}^2) \bar{\delta}_{n-1} \bar{\Delta}_{n-2} + (1 - \psi_n^2) \bar{\Delta}_{n-2} + \psi_{n-1} \bar{\delta}_{n-1} \bar{f}_{n-1} + \psi_n \bar{f}_n \\ &= (1 - \psi_n^2) \bar{\Delta}_0 + \sum_{i=1}^n \psi_i^2 (1 - \psi_{i-1}^2) \left(\prod_{j=i-1}^{n-1} \bar{\delta}_j \right) + \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \psi_i \left(\prod_{j=i}^{n-1} \bar{\delta}_j \right) \bar{f}_i + \psi_n \bar{f}_n. \end{aligned}$$

By (8.2) on $[t_{n+1}, t_n]$, and by the choice of $\bar{\delta}_j$ and (8.35) we finally obtain (8.42).

Hence, $(\bar{v}_n, \bar{p}_n, \bar{R}_n) \rightarrow (\bar{v}, \bar{p}, \bar{R})$ in $C^0(\mathbb{T}^3 \times [0, 1])$, with $\bar{R} \equiv 0$, $\bar{v}(0) \equiv \bar{v}_n(0) = \bar{v}_0(0)$, total kinetic energy $\int |\bar{v}|^2 = e$ and solving (1.1). □

REFERENCES

- [BT10] Bardos, C. and Titi, E.S. *Loss of smoothness and energy conserving rough weak solutions for the 3d Euler equations*, Discr. Cont. Dyn. Sys., Series S, 3(2), 185-197 (2010).
- [BDLS11] Brenier, Y., De Lellis, C. and Székelyhidi, Jr., L. *Weak-strong uniqueness for measure valued solutions* Comm. Math. Phys. 305, 351-361 (2011).
- [BuDLS13] Buckmaster, T., De Lellis, C. and Székelyhidi, Jr., L. (in preparation)
- [Chi12] Chiodaroli, E. *A counterexample to well-posedness of entropy solutions to the compressible Euler system*, Preprint arXiv:1201.3470 (2012).
- [Cho12] Choffrut, A. *H-principles for the incompressible Euler equations*, Preprint arXiv:1209.5964 (2012).
- [ChDLS12] Choffrut, A., De Lellis, C. and Székelyhidi, Jr., L. *Dissipative continuous Euler flows in two and three dimensions*, Preprint arXiv:1205.1226 (2012).

- [CET94] Constantin, P., E. W., and Titi, E. S. *Onsagers conjecture on the energy conservation for solutions of Eulers equation*. Comm. Math. Phys. 165, 1, 207209 (1994).
- [CDLS12] Conti, S., De Lellis, C., and Székelyhidi, Jr., L. *H-principle and rigidity for C^1 isometric embeddings*. Nonlinear Partial Differential Equations Abel Symposia Volume 7, 83-116 (2012).
- [CFG11] Cordoba, D., Faraco, D., and Gancedo, F. *Lack of uniqueness for weak solutions of the incompressible porous media equation*. Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal. 200, 3, 725746 (2011).
- [DLS11] De Lellis, C. and Székelyhidi, Jr., L. *The h-principle and the equations of fluid dynamics*. Bull. Amer. Math. Soc. 49, 347-375, (2012).
- [DLS12] De Lellis, C. and Székelyhidi, Jr., L. *Dissipative continuous Euler flows* Preprint arXiv:1202.1751 (2012), to appear in Inventiones Mathematicae.
- [DLS12H] De Lellis, C. and Székelyhidi, Jr., L. *Dissipative Euler flows and Onsager's conjecture* Preprint arXiv:1205.3626 (2012).
- [DLS07] De Lellis, C. and Székelyhidi, Jr., L. *The Euler equations as a differential inclusion* Ann. of Math. (2) 170, 3, 14171436 (2009).
- [DLS10] De Lellis, C. and Székelyhidi, Jr., L. *On admissibility criteria for weak solutions of the Euler equations*. Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal. 195, 1, 225260 (2010).
- [Eyi94] Eyink, G. L. *Energy dissipation without viscosity in ideal hydrodynamics. I. Fourier analysis and local energy transfer*, Phys. D 78, 3-4, 222240 (1994).
- [Gro86] Gromov, M. *Partial differential relations*, vol. 9 of Ergebnisse der Mathematik und ihrer Grenzgebiete (3). Springer-Verlag, Berlin (1986).
- [Gun26] Gunther, N. *On the motion of fluid in a moving container*, Izv. Akad. Nauk SSSR. Ser. Fiz.-Mat. 20, 1323-1348, 1503-1532 (1926); 21 (1927).
- [Ise12] Isett, P. *Hölder continuous Euler flows in three dimensions with compact support in time* Preprint arXiv:1211.4065 (2012).
- [Kui55] Kuiper, N. *On C^1 isometric imbeddings i,ii* . Proc. Kon. Acad. Wet. Amsterdam A 58, 545556, 683689 (1955).
- [Lic25] Lichtenstein, L. *Über einige Existenzprobleme der Hydrodynamik homogener unzusammendruckbarer, reibungsglosser Flüssigkeiten und die Helmholtzschen Wirbelsaltze*, Math. Zeit. 23, 89-154 (1925); 26 (1927); 32 (1930).
- [BM02] Majda, A. J., and Bertozzi, A. L. *Vorticity and incompressible flow*, vol. 27 of Cambridge Texts in Applied Mathematics. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, (2002).
- [Nash54] Nash, J. *C^1 isometric imbeddings*, Ann. Math. 60, 383396 (1954).
- [Ons49] Onsager, L. *Statistical hydrodynamics*, Nuovo Cimento (9) 6, 2 (Convegno Internazionale di Meccanica Statistica), 279287 (1949).
- [Sch93] Scheffer, V. *An inviscid flow with compact support in space-time*. J. Geom. Anal. 3, 4, 343401 (1993).
- [Shn97] Shnirelman, A. *On the uniqueness of weak solutions of the Euler equations*. Comm. Pure Appl. Math. 50, 12, 12611286 (1997).
- [Shn00] Shnirelman, A. *Weak solutions with decreasing energy of incompressible Euler equations*. Comm. Math. Phys. 210, 3, 541603 (2000).
- [Shv11] Shvydkoy, R. *Convex integration for a class of active scalar equations*. J. Amer. Math. Soc. 24, 4, 11591174 (2011).
- [Sz11] Székelyhidi, Jr., L. *Weak solutions to the incompressible Euler equations with vortex sheet initial data* C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris S r. I Math. 349, 19-20, 10631066 (2011).
- [Sz11] Székelyhidi, Jr., L. *Relaxation of the incompressible porous medium equation* Ann. Sci. Ec. Norm. Sup. 45, 3, 491-509 (2012).
- [SzW12] Székelyhidi, Jr., L. and Wiedemann, E. *Young measures generated by ideal incompressible fluid flows* Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal. 206, 1, 333-366 (2012).
- [Wie11] Wiedemann, E. *Existence of weak solutions for the incompressible Euler equations* Ann. Inst. H. Poincar Anal. Non Linéaire 28, 5, 727-730 (2011).